Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-206
Wednesday
24 October 1990

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-206 *24 October 1990*

CONTENTS

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Moiseyev Comments on Upcoming NATO Meeting *[TASS]* 1
Reporter's 'Conjectures' on SS-23's Dismissed *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 20 Oct]* 1

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

TASS Reports Gremitskikh's 23 Oct Briefing 2
Denies Intention To Join NATO 2
Says No Ultimatum to Saddam 2
Comments on Evacuations From Iraq 2
Assesses Baker's Award Statement 2
Praises U.S. Moves on El Salvador 3
Supports French View on CSCE 3
Previews Argentine Leader's Visit 4
Notes Improving Ties in Balkans 4
Views Soviet-German Space Project 4
Welcomes Inter-Korean Dialogue 4
Discusses Future Role of UN 5
Commentator Sees Military End to Gulf Crisis *[Moscow International]* 5
UN Supervision Seen as Deterrent to Aggression *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 19 Oct]* 6
Belorussian Minister Speaks on UN IAEA Report *[TASS]* 7

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

U.S.-Soviet Gulf Cooperation Surveyed *[IZVESTIYA 14 Oct]* 9
TASS Reports U.S. To Send Tanks to Saudi Arabia 11
Political Constraints on U.S. Gulf Action Noted *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 17 Oct]* 11
House Approves Intelligence Appropriations Bill *[PRAVDA 20 Oct]* 12
U.S. President's Assistant Visits Kaluga *[TASS]* 12
Official Speaks at U.S. Publishers' Forum *[PRAVDA 22 Oct]* 12

Northeast Asia

Japanese Intentions in Gulf Worries Neighbors *[TASS]* 13
Soviet-Japanese Spaceflight Scheduled 2 Dec *[TASS]* 13
'Positive Shifts' Seen in Inter-Korean Ties *[PRAVDA 20 Oct]* 14
Historian on PRC Participation in Korean War *[Moscow International]* 14

Near East & South Asia

Officials Visit Saudi Arabia on Gulf Crisis 15
Katushev-Led Delegation Arrives *[TASS]* 15
Primakov Departs for Riyadh *[London KUNA]* 15
Continued Aid, Support to Afghanistan Questioned *[Moscow International]* 15
Afghan Mujahidin Oppose Outside Influence *[SOVETSKAYA MOLODEZH 18 Sep]* 16
Pakistani, U.S. Involvement in Afghanistan Viewed *[TASS]* 16
Shipping Line With Egypt Established *[TASS]* 17
Saudi Businessmen Establish Contacts in Moscow *[PRAVDA 22 Oct]* 17
Envoy to United Arab Emirates Replaced *[IZVESTIYA 20 Oct]* 17

Sub-Saharan Africa

Reports Cite Efforts To End Rwandan Conflict 17
Call for Cease-Fire Viewed *[Moscow International]* 17
Diplomatic Efforts Reported *[Moscow International]* 18
Report Notes Delegation's Visit to South Africa *[Moscow International]* 18
RSA Defense Minister Allows Forces' Inspection *[Moscow International]* 19
Commentary Urges Peace Talks in Ethiopia *[Moscow International]* 19

East Europe

Officer Remarks on Troop Withdrawal From CSFR *[Moscow International]* 19
Polish Leader Views 'Unshaken' Soviet Friendship *[Warsaw PAP]* 20
Poland Signs Agreement on Food Supplies *[IZVESTIYA 19 Oct]* 20
Yugoslavian Federal Assembly Threatened by Split *[IZVESTIYA 22 Oct]* 21
Hungary Seeks Reassessment of 1956 'Intervention' *[Budapest Radio]* 22

West Europe

Reports Note Gorbachev Plan To Visit Spain 22
PRAVDA Notes 26-28 Oct Visit *[20 Oct]* 22
Spanish Premier Cited *[IZVESTIYA 20 Oct]* 22
'Widespread Interest' Noted *[TASS]* 22
Economic Reports Readied *[Moscow TV]* 22
GDR Fighter Transfer to Bundeswehr Causes Worry *[IZVESTIYA 22 Oct]* 23
German Army Commander's Visit Announced *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 20 Oct]* 23
Soviet, German Police To Fight Organized Crime *[Berlin ADN]* 24
Trade Cooperation Session With Britain Viewed *[PRAVDA 22 Oct]* 24
Gorbachev Receives British Publisher *[TASS]* 25
British Coverage of Primakov's UK Visit *[cross-reference]* 25
Luxembourg Prime Minister's Visit Continues 25
Visits Car Factory *[TASS]* 25
Meets With Lukyanov *[TASS]* 25
Gives Dinner Speech *[IZVESTIYA 24 Oct]* 25
Attends Art Exhibition 23 Oct *[TASS]* 27
Petrovskiy, Luxembourg Official Hold Talks *[TASS]* 27
Deputy Foreign Minister Receives Luxembourg Envoy *[IZVESTIYA 21 Oct]* 27
Consular Officials Attend Luxembourg Conference *[TASS]* 27

Latin America & Caribbean

Argentine President Menem Visits Soviet Union 28
Visit Previewed *[TASS]* 28
Shevardnadze Greets Menem *[TASS]* 28
Trip To Be Cut Short *[Buenos Aires NOTICIAS ARGENTINAS]* 28
Deputy Foreign Minister Receives Argentine Envoy *[TASS]* 28
Baklanov, Others Call on Cuban Ambassador *[PRAVDA 18 Oct]* 28
Fidel Castro's Private Life, Security Viewed *[KOMOSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 18 Oct]* 29
Cuban Scientists To Cooperate in Nuclear Physics *[TASS]* 29

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Supreme Soviet

Supreme Soviet Endorses Anti-Profiteering Bill *[TASS]* 31
Supreme Soviet Passes Law on Self-Government *[TASS]* 31
Deputies Support 'Gala' To Mark Revolution Day *[TASS]* 32
Session Focuses on Railroads, October Celebration *[Moscow Radio]* 32
Railroads Said Facing 'Collapse' *[TASS]* 33
Supreme Soviet 23 Oct Session Outlined *[Moscow TV]* 33
Comparison of 19 Oct Gorbachev Economic Speech 33

Political & Social

Gorbachev Discusses Union Treaty With Republics *[TASS]* 35
Ryzhkov Interviewed on Economy *[Moscow International]* 36
Ryzhkov on Cooperation with Trade Unions *[TASS]* 38
Union Leader on Unions' Present, Future Role *[TASS]* 38
Reductions at Nuclear Stations Called Coincidence *[IZVESTIYA 24 Oct]* 39
Kaganovich Denies Interview With Italian Paper *[Moscow International]* 39
Political Parties View Union Treaty *[IZVESTIYA 12 Oct]* 39
PRAVDA Claims Crisis Story Inaccurate *[23 Oct]* 43
PRAVDA 'Crisis' Reflects CPSU Dilemma *[NEW TIMES No 42]* 44
Law on Freedom of Conscience, Religion *[PRAVDA 9 Oct]* 48
Politburo Issues Slogans for October Anniversary *[PRAVDA 24 Oct]* 53
Aganbegyan Credits Gorbachev With Economic Plan *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 20 Oct]* 53
Yakovlev Asserts Viability of 'Socialist Idea' *[TASS]* 54
Non-CPSU Democratic Platform Evolves *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 13 Oct]* 54
Shenin Says Defense Ministry To Pay Servicemen *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 19 Oct]* 55
Shenin on CPSU Journal's Plans for 1991 *[PRAVDA 19 Oct]* 56
Moscow Court Adjourns Kalugin Hearing *[TASS]* 57
Trade Unions Exempt From Organizations Law *[TRUD 11 Oct]* 57
Liberal-Democratic Party Elects Leaders *[TASS]* 58
Mining Industry Fears Market Transition *[Moscow TV]* 59
Baklanov Attends Party Meeting at MiG Plant *[PRAVDA 21 Oct]* 59
Kalmykov Discusses Public Associations Law *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 3 Oct]* 59
Journalist's Relations With Soviets Reviewed *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 23 Oct]* 60
Writers Union Files Suit on ZNAMYA Registration *[Moscow Radio]* 61
Editor Views Trial, Writers Union *[LITERATURNA GAZETA No 42]* 61
PRAVDA Attracts Only 500,000 Subscribers *[Moscow Radio]* 63
Subscriptions 'Drastically' Reduced *[PRAVDA 20 Oct]* 63
Frolov Meets With Journalists and Readers *[PRAVDA 20 Oct]* 64
IZVESTIYA Deputy Forecasts Paper's Trends *[Moscow Radio]* 65
ZVEZDA Editor Outlines Publishing Plans *[Moscow TV]* 65
News Conference on Newspapers' Registration *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 18 Oct]* 65
New Aryan Magazine Established *[MOSCOW NEWS No 40]* 65
New Weekly To Prepare People for Market Economy *[PRAVDA 12 Oct]* 66
KROKODIL Magazine Editor Interviewed *[Moscow TV]* 66
PEOPLE'S DEPUTY Editor Interviewed *[Moscow Radio]* 67
DIALOG Magazine Editor Interviewed *[Moscow TV]* 67
EKHO PLANETY Chief Interviewed *[Moscow TV]* 68
Ministry Registers THE REPORTER Newspaper *[Moscow Radio]* 68
Paper Publishes First Issue Since 1917 *[Moscow International]* 68
Chief Editor on New Journal SLOVO *[Moscow TV]* 68
New Women's Newspaper for Charitable Purposes *[Moscow Radio]* 69
Leaders Sign Academy Adviser's Obituary *[PRAVDA 21 Oct]* 69

Economic

Aganbegyan Interviewed on Market Economy *[IZVESTIYA 24 Oct]* 69
Rail Minister Urges Workers To Oppose Strikes *[GUDOK 7 Oct]* 72
Rail Ministry Official Details Transport Losses *[GUDOK 7 Oct]* 73
Pechora Coal Concern Deplores Future Uncertainty *[Moscow TV]* 75
Auto Giant To Change to Small, Leasehold Units *[Moscow TV]* 75
Industrial Alliance Set Up Based on Bratsk Timber *[Moscow TV]* 75

Scientific

Orbital Data Published for Cosmos-2102 Satellite *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 18 Oct]* 76
Mir Cosmonauts Continue Experiments *[TASS]* 76

Military

U.S., Soviet Military 'Openness' Pondered *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 20 Oct]* 76
Yazov Addresses Military Trade Unions Congress *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 20 Oct]* 78
Moscow Citizens Trying To Avoid Conscription *[Moscow TV]* 79

REGIONAL AFFAIRS

Baltic Republics

Moscow-Baltic Ties Debated at FRG Foundation *[IZVESTIYA 22 Oct]* 80
Landsbergis Meets Hungarian Leaders in Budapest *[Vilnius Radio]* 80
Landsbergis Concludes Visit *[Vilnius Radio]* 80
Landsbergis Cites 'Increasing Threat' of USSR *[EKHO LITVY 20 Sep]* 80
Prunskiene Encouraged by Government-Parties Meeting *[Vilnius Radio]* 81
Prunskiene Views Kaunas Anti-Government Criticisms *[EKHO LITVY 20 Sep]* 81
11 March Party Renamed 'Party of Independence' *[Moscow Radio]* 82
Poor Lithuanian Economic Performance Detailed *[TASS]* 83
Ignalina Nuclear Power Station Block Shut Down *[Vilnius Radio]* 83
Disunity in Estonian Foreign Policy Examined *[TASS]* 83
Russians From Estonia Protest RSFSR Treaty *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 17 Oct]* 83
Estonian Defense Forces Conflict Foreseen *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 16 Oct]* 85
Lauristin Assesses Estonia-RSFSR Talks *[SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA 5 Oct]* 86
Narva Protests Estonian 'Economic Border' *[SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA 5 Oct]* 88
Authors of IME Plan View Impact, Future of Plan *[SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA 28 Sep]* 89
Latvian Government Leaders Meet With Shevardnadze *[Riga Radio]* 91
Latvia Alters Constitutional Voting Article *[Riga Radio]* 91
Latvian Constitutional Amendments Reported *[TASS]* 91

RSFSR

Coverage of RSFSR Supreme Soviet Proceedings 92
23 October Session Reported *[Moscow TV]* 92
Khasbulatov Speech *[Moscow TV]* 93
Control By Center Criticized *[PRAVDA 24 Oct]* 95
Yeltsin Discusses RSFSR-Moldavia Treaty *[MOLDOVA SUVERANA 29 Sep]* 96
Yavlinskiy Assesses Economic Reform Prospects *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 23 Oct]* 97
RSFSR Communists' Initiative Congress Held *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 23 Oct]* 97
Media Committee Views Subscription Decline *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 23 Oct]* 98
RSFSR Renames Town, City, Oblast *[Moscow Radio]* 98
Nakhodka Free Enterprise Zone To Be Established *[TASS]* 98
Sverdlovsk Wins Foreign Trading Entitlement *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 24 Oct]* 99
Volgograd Radio Sees Opportunity in Jamming End *[PRAVDA 19 Oct]* 99
New Mordovian Supreme Soviet Chairman Elected *[Moscow TV]* 100
Chelyabinsk Watch Plant Diversifies Output *[Moscow TV]* 100
Khasbulatov Pays Visit to Hungary *[cross-reference]* 101

Western Republics

Ukrainian Prime Minister Tenders Resignation 101
Masol Resigns *[TASS]* 101
Interim Prime Minister Named *[Moscow Radio]* 101
Ukraine KGB Investigated Chernobyl Effects *[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 42]* 101
Crisis Situation in Kiev Soviet Reported *[PRAVDA 14 Oct]* 103
Snegur Speech on Moldavian Sovereignty Published *[MOLDOVA SUVERANA No 6]* 103
Gagauz Republic Nationalist Sentiments Viewed *[SOVETSKAYA MOLDOVA 23 Sep]* 106
Belorussian Communist Party Draft Bylaws *[SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA 22 Sep]* 108

Caucasus

Situation in Nagorno-Karabakh Reported Worsening *[TASS]* 116

Two Armenian Legislators Released From Jail *[TASS]* 117
Armenian Supreme Soviet Informed *[Yerevan Radio]* 117
Armenian Supreme Soviet Passes Decisions 117
On Detaining Deputies *[ARMENPRES]* 117
On Service for Draft Dodgers *[ARMENPRES]* 118
On Conscription *[ARMENPRES]* 118
New State Commission Formed in Armenia *[ARMENPRES]* 118
Baku Introduces Passport System for Goods Purchase *[Moscow Radio]* 119
Georgian Supreme Soviet Poll Procedures Detailed *[Moscow TV]* 119
Georgian National Congress To Begin 26 October *[Moscow International]* 119
Congress Elections Assessed *[TASS]* 119

Moiseyev Comments on Upcoming NATO Meeting

LD2410092990 Moscow TASS in English 0843 GMT 24 Oct 90

[By TASS diplomatic correspondent Oleg Moskovskiy]

[Text] Moscow October 24 TASS—Soviet Chief of Staff General Mikhail Moiseyev left Moscow this morning for a three-day visit to Belgium.

Before his departure, Moiseyev told TASS that he was scheduled to meet the Belgian military leadership in Brussels and give a lecture at the Supreme Royal Defense Institute today.

During the next two days, he is due to meet the leadership of the NATO International Secretariat, attend the closing stage of the NATO Military Committee's autumn session at the level of the chiefs of staffs and meet the commanders of the NATO allied armed forces.

"Relations between NATO and the Warsaw Pact are now being built on a new basis," Moiseyev stressed. He said it was his wish to exchange views with the NATO leadership on an extensive range of questions.

New thinking in the military sphere, Moiseyev said, has led to a considerable reduction of the intensity of Soviet military activity, cuts in the number of major exercises and manoeuvres and greater restraint in day-to-day activities.

Moiseyev said that it was desirable that NATO reciprocate by cutting the scale of its exercises of the Wintex type. This is most important at a time when confrontation is being replaced by the policy of cooperation and mutual understanding, including in the military sphere.

Moiseyev said the Soviet military doctrine with its defence orientation was graphic illustration of the Soviet Union's peace policy. The doctrine's central idea is that of focusing efforts to prevent war and solve all international problems by political means. This doctrine is the basis of military reform in the Soviet Armed Forces.

On changes in the Soviet Armed Forces, Moiseyev also said: "A major cut in Soviet Armed Forces by 500,000 men is now under way, with 370,000 already released.

"In Europe, cuts comprised more than 20,000 tanks, 20,000 artillery systems, more than 860 combat aircraft, 26 submarines and 45 combat ships.

"The entire structure of the Soviet Armed Forces is being changed in line with the defensive military doctrine," he stressed.

Soviet troops will be fully withdrawn from Hungary and Czechoslovakia in 1991, and from Poland and Germany later, he said. The defence of the Soviet Union will be organized only within national boundaries on the principle of reasonable sufficiency.

Reporter's 'Conjectures' on SS-23's Dismissed

PM2310111890 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 20 Oct 90 First Edition p 5

[M. Ponomarev report under the "Observer's Rejoinder" rubric: "Whose Purpose Do Conjectures Serve?"]

[Text] The journalist B. Gertz, citing the Pentagon and the U.S. intelligence organs recently in THE WASHINGTON TIMES, got involved in conjectures about the OTR-23's [Operational-Tactical Missile] (these missiles are classified as SS-23 in NATO) that were transferred (sold) at one time by the Soviet Union to Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, and the GDR. The USSR is accused of no more and no less than violating the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles (the OTR-23 is classified among the shorter-range missiles, up to 1,000 km).

What is the situation in this sphere, in fact?

Soviet OTR-23 missiles did indeed come under the list of missiles to be destroyed. As of today, all missiles of this class and their nuclear warhead cases have already been destroyed in full accordance with the procedures stipulated. As for the missiles that B. Gertz is now making a fuss about in THE WASHINGTON TIMES, the Soviet Union has repeatedly officially stated that it sold a certain number of non-nuclear-armed OTR-23 missiles to its Warsaw Pact allies and consequently they are under their full jurisdiction now. Moreover, this sale took place before 1 June 1988; that is, before the treaty entered into force. Thus the above-mentioned missiles cannot in any way come under the effect of this Soviet-American document.

Representatives of the American administration could confirm this quite easily if they asked the countries that received the OTR-23 missiles. Furthermore, the missiles that were at one time sold to the GDR are today the property of the unified Germany which belongs, like the United States, to NATO.

Evidently the conjectures published in THE WASHINGTON TIMES were necessary to someone who is trying to ruin the good relations between the USSR and the United States which are being established at present or to those people who want to avoid the need to explain what happened to the nuclear warheads from the Pershing-1A missiles (these missiles belonged to the FRG and their nuclear warheads belonged to the United States). According to the spirit and letter of the treaty, intermediate- and shorter-range missile warhead cases belonging to the USSR and the United States are to be destroyed.

The initiators of such conjectures should look at the prevailing situation in the world more often and not look for ways to exacerbate it.

TASS Reports Gremitskikh's 23 Oct Briefing

Denies Intention To Join NATO

LD2310173190 Moscow TASS in English 1718 GMT 23 Oct 90

[By TASS diplomatic correspondents Aleksandr Kanishchev and Sergey Postanogov]

[Text] Moscow October 23 TASS—Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Yuriy Gremitskikh today dismissed a claim by a Soviet scholar that "the Soviet Union will enter NATO probably next autumn" as not corresponding to the national leadership's real position.

The claim by Viktor Gaiduk was reported several days ago by the Spanish news agency EFE, which called him "a Soviet presidential adviser" and an "academician".

Commenting on the report at a briefing, Gremitskikh said that "Viktor Gaiduk is neither a Soviet presidential adviser nor an academician."

"He is a senior research fellow at the Soviet Academy of Sciences' Institute of General History, who attended a seminar on the international situation in Italy as a member of a delegation from the Soviet public," explained the spokesman.

Gremitskikh said that Gaiduk "expressed his personal point of view on the possibility of the Soviet Union joining NATO."

"In terms of his work, Viktor Gaiduk does not have access to corresponding information and, judging by his view of the future system of European security, does not actually have such information," he said.

Says No Ultimatum to Saddam

LD2310153890 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1451 GMT 23 Oct 90

[By TASS diplomatic correspondents Aleksandr Kanishchev and Sergey Postanogov; from the USSR Foreign Ministry press center]

[Text] Moscow, 23 Oct (TASS)—Yuriy Gremitskikh, first deputy head of the Information Administration of the USSR Foreign Ministry, speaking at a briefing today, described as a "fabrication from start to finish" an article in THE WASHINGTON POST that reported a "secret ultimatum" from Mikhail Gorbachev allegedly conveyed to the Iraqi leader, Saddam Husayn.

In its 23 October edition, the U.S. newspaper published an article by J. Anderson and D. Van Atta, quoting "reports by high-ranking intelligence sources." The article claims that on 5 October, during his visit to Baghdad, Yevgeniy Primakov, special envoy of the USSR president, allegedly handed the Iraqi leader a "secret ultimatum from the Soviet leader." Specifically, the article says: "U.S. officials with access to particularly secret intelligence materials have reported that Yevgeniy Primakov handed Saddam an 'ultimatum' which was not 'ambiguous.' If he does not leave Kuwait 'he can expect war with the Soviet Union,' the sources reported."

Replying at the briefing to a TASS correspondent's request to comment on this passage by the authors of the THE WASHINGTON POST report, Yuriy Gremitskikh said: "This report has nothing to do with the real state of affairs and is a fabrication from start to finish."

Comments on Evacuations From Iraq

LD2310145390 Moscow TASS in English 1408 GMT 23 Oct 90

[By TASS diplomatic correspondents Aleksandr Kanishchev and Sergey Postanogov]

[Text] Moscow October 23 TASS—About 4,300 Soviet specialists remain in Iraq today, Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Yuriy Gremitskikh told a briefing here today.

Noting that the evacuation is being carried out by regular Aeroflot flights twice a week, Gremitskikh said that five flights were made in October: 123 people returned to the USSR on October 8, 260—on October 12, 136—on October 15, 277—on October 19 and 118 people—on October 22.

Soviet specialists are departing for home, "as the necessary formalities are being executed".

Assesses Baker's Award Statement

LD2310183890 Moscow TASS in English 1815 GMT 23 Oct 90

[By TASS diplomatic correspondents Aleksandr Kanishchev and Sergey Postanogov]

[Text] Moscow October 23 TASS—A statement by U.S. Secretary of State James Baker at the American Committee on U.S.-Soviet Relations is in tune with Soviet public opinion, Soviet Foreign Ministry Spokesman Yuriy Gremitskikh told a briefing here today.

Baker spoke after the committee decided to award him the George Kennan prize.

Gremitskikh said that Baker's "appraisal of the international situation and the driving forces of the present changes in world politics" is similar, in many ways with "the opinion held by the Soviet public."

The spokesman said that Baker again pointed to the role of Soviet new thinking and perestroyka in ending the cold war and laying the foundation for a new world order.

He noted that George Bush's statement 18 months ago concerning the U.S. intention to move away from the doctrine of containment, created a sound basis for progress in nuclear and non-nuclear disarmament.

Bush's statement gave impetus to the review of the Soviet and American military doctines on the principle of defence sufficiency.

"Similar instructions by the two countries' leaderships inaugurated the switch from mutual understanding to cooperation and even partnership in key issues of our relations."

Noting the great role of Soviet-American interaction in German unification, Gremitskikh said: "We should now work on bringing down the level of armaments in Europe and channel the activities of opposing blocs into the European process."

The spokesman also noted that "cooperation between the two countries in settling regional conflicts has risen to a new level. This cooperation is now being tested by the Gulf crisis."

"The prevention of international conflicts and assistance in consolidating peace-making efforts, based on the United Nations' revival, should now become a key area in Soviet-American interaction," he continued.

"We also support Baker's idea that the concept for the development of Soviet-American cooperation should proceed from the premise that our partnership will be a norm, not an exception.

"The Soviet side intends to cover its part of the road to the common goal: the conclusion of landmark understandings on security by the end of this year.

"This goal should also include stronger interaction in other areas to strengthen the foundation, on which a new peaceful era in the development of human civilisation will be built.

"The Soviet-American partnership is the centerpiece in the structure of a peaceful, free and secure future," Gremitskikh stressed.

Praises U.S. Moves on El Salvador

LD2310192590 Moscow TASS in English 1905 GMT 23 Oct 90

[By TASS diplomatic correspondents Aleksandr Kanishchev and Sergey Postanogov]

[Text] Moscow October 23 TASS—At a briefing here today, a senior Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman commented on materials about Soviet-U.S. interaction in peaceful settlements in Central America, which have been released by several news organisations recently.

Yuriy Gremitskikh denied allegations that this cooperation became possible thanks to Washington's efforts to involve the USSR deeper in the peace process in the region.

"In this regard, we deem it necessary to recall that from the outset the Soviet Union has persistently advocated a peaceful political settlement of the conflicts. It called for Central Americans themselves to conduct the quest for a settlement and for regional states, including the USSR and the United States, to give comprehensive assistance to these efforts," Gremitskikh said.

"This consistent and principled line pursued by our country made possible Soviet-U.S. interaction in defusing the crisis situation in the aforementioned region, interaction that is becoming increasingly productive," Gremitskikh added. "This interaction was also reflected during the recent Soviet-U.S. talks."

"At the same time, we proceed from the premise that it is not important who claims priority in launching this or other initiative. It is important that positive shifts in Central America became possible because of the growing understanding in the world, including in the United States, that force cannot succeed and that the existing problems should be solved at the negotiating table," Gremitskikh emphasised.

In conclusion, Gremitskikh positively evaluated the recent decision by the U.S. Senate, which impedes providing military aid to Salvadorean Government. The Senate also expressed support for an early political settlement in that country.

"We think that this decision, if complemented with other specific steps by the United States in favour of a peaceful settlement of the Salvadorean conflict, can facilitate efforts to normalise the situation in that country and in the region as a whole," Gremitskikh stressed.

Supports French View on CSCE

LD2310162190 Moscow TASS in English 1609 GMT 23 Oct 90

[By TASS diplomatic correspondents Aleksandr Kanishchev and Sergey Postanogov]

[Text] Moscow October 23 TASS—A Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman today welcomed French Prime Minister Michel Rocard's remarks that the Paris summit of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) should mark the start of work to build a pan-European security system.

Spokesman Yuriy Gremitskikh said: "We welcome constructive statements and initiatives which accord with the spirit of the times and are geared to building a new Europe on the basis of equal partnership, trust and balanced interests."

Gremitskikh, who was commenting at a briefing on Rocard's speech at the French National Defence Institute on Monday, also said that the Soviet Union attaches much importance to the forthcoming CSCE summit in Paris.

He welcomed Rocard's remarks that "one result of the Paris conference of the heads of state and government of CSCE countries should be the start of work to create a

system of pan-European security" and that contacts within NATO and the Western European Union should therefore be supplemented with closer relations with Eastern European nations.

Previews Argentine Leader's Visit

LD2310152490 Moscow TASS in English 1505 GMT 23 Oct 90

[By TASS diplomatic correspondents Aleksandr Kanishchev and Sergey Postanogov]

[Text] Moscow October 23 TASS—President Carlos Saul Menem of Argentina is expected to sign a declaration on principles for cooperation between the Soviet Union and Argentina during his forthcoming working visit to Moscow, scheduled for October 24 to 26, a Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman told a briefing here today.

Yuriy Gremitskikh said Menem is also expected to sign agreements to cooperate in the peaceful use of atomic energy, in space research and exploration for peaceful purposes and in efforts to combat the abuse of drugs and psychotropic agents and their illegal production and trafficking.

The spokesman described Menem's scheduled meeting with President Mikhail Gorbachev as the "highlight" of the visit. The programme also includes a meeting between Menem and Soviet parliament Chairman Anatoliy Lukyanov and a meeting between the two countries' foreign ministers.

The Argentine president and his entourage will make a trip to Leningrad.

"We are sure that this visit will be an important step in invigorating political interaction between the Soviet Union and Argentina," Gremitskikh said.

"It will help improve the quality of bilateral ties and establish mutual understanding and cooperation in international relations."

Notes Improving Ties in Balkans

LD2310181890 Moscow TASS in English 1742 GMT 23 Oct 90

[By TASS diplomatic correspondents Aleksandr Kanishchev and Sergey Postanogov]

[Text] Moscow October 23 TASS—The Soviet Union takes a positive view of practical efforts on the Balkan peninsula to improve mutual understanding and good-neighbourly cooperation among the countries situated there, Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Yuriy Gremitskikh told a briefing here today.

He was commenting on the second conference of the foreign ministers of Balkan countries, which opens in Tirana on Wednesday.

"We see multilateral cooperation in the Balkans as a result of deep and positive changes in European and world politics and as part and parcel of the Helsinki process," Gremitskikh said.

He expressed hope that the Tirana conference would help step up efforts to strengthen trust and security in the Balkans and make a weighty contribution to more democratic international relations, in line with positive changes under way elsewhere in Europe.

Views Soviet-German Space Project

LD2310182690 Moscow TASS in English 1725 GMT 23 Oct 90

[By TASS diplomatic correspondents Aleksandr Kanishchev and Sergey Postanogov]

[Text] Moscow October 23 TASS—Experts from the Soviet cosmonaut training centre and the German aerospace agency have held preliminary consultations as part of scientific and technological cooperation between the two countries, Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Yuriy Gremitskikh told a briefing here today.

He said they discussed practical aspects of bilateral cooperation in the exploration of outer space, possibly under the aegis of the European Space Agency.

Gremitskikh said the development of bilateral and multilateral cooperation in space is natural among countries building a common European home.

One result of the consultations, he said, was the decision to continue talks in the near future, when practical preparations have begun for a Soviet-German space flight.

Welcomes Inter-Korean Dialogue

LD2310214190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1419 GMT 23 Oct 90

[By diplomatic correspondents Aleksandr Kanishchev and Sergey Postanogov; from the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs press center]

[Text] Moscow, 23 Oct (TASS)—"The Soviet Union sincerely greets the development of the dialogue between the DPRK and South Korea and wishes success to the talks," Yuriy Gremitskikh, first deputy chief of the Information Directorate of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, said today at a briefing when he commented on a meeting between the prime ministers of the DPRK and the Republic of Korea on the issues related to relieving military and political tension on the Korean peninsula and developing broad cooperation and exchanges, which took place a few days ago.

"We believe," Yuriy Gremitskikh added, "that hopes for success will be greater if this time the South Korean side

refrains from holding the 'Team Spirit' large-scale military maneuvers jointly with the United States, which in the past lit a red light on the way of the inter-Korean dialogue more than once."

The representative of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs said that the intention of the sides to seek solutions that are mutually acceptable gives hope. Their decision to hold the third round of talks in December 1990 shows that.

The diplomat expressed hope that both sides would continue to search for a solution to the problem of Korea's joining the United Nations, which would be mutually acceptable. "The Soviet Union as a permanent member of the UN Security Council," he noted, "supports any such decision they make."

Discusses Future Role of UN

LD2310164890 Moscow TASS in English 1600 GMT 23 Oct 90

[By TASS diplomatic correspondents Aleksandr Kanishchev and Sergey Postanogov]

[Text] Moscow October 23 TASS—"One of the most important tasks of the international community is to increase the worldwide role of the United Nations," Dmitriy Titov, deputy head of the International Organisations Department of the USSR Foreign Ministry, told a briefing here today.

The briefing for Soviet and foreign correspondents was devoted to the 45th anniversary of establishing the United Nations.

Titov noted that "the UN role would grow if the main UN bodies—the General Assembly, Security Council, and the International Court of Justice—improve the efficiency of their work."

"The Soviet Union vigorously promotes the process of establishing the UN as a stabiliser and regulator of world politics during sweeping changes inside the organisation and in the world," he continued.

"This is a component of the new Soviet policy aimed at our comprehensive involvement in the international community. The aim of the Soviet Union is to form, with the UN close participation, an integral system of global partnership for the 1990's and the beginning of the next century."

Titov noted that mutual understanding and cooperation between the Soviet Union and the United States are the most important condition for UN fruitful work.

This cooperation and understanding are dynamically developing and assuming new qualities.

"The international community is waiting from the United Nations not for declarations but for specific deeds, including those in social and economic development," Titov stressed.

Commentator Sees Military End to Gulf Crisis

LD2310135190 Moscow World Service in English 1210 GMT 23 Oct 90

[Text] In Moscow practically nothing is known yet about the results of the talks between the Soviet president's special envoy, Yevgeniy Primakov, and Western leaders in Rome, Paris, Washington, and London. The absence of details compels one to think of a military, not a peaceful, solution to the Gulf crisis. Here is the view of our commentator Mikhail Mayorov.

It is hard to remember when it was in the past that the USSR assumed the role of a mediator in any regional conflict, and this conflict in the Middle East is very complicated and confused and involves so many obvious and potential participants. In this case, there is an apparent desire of Moscow to play a new role also in the world community in general, and in that region in particular, but this desire alone may not be enough to prevent an armed clash between Iraq and the multinational force. It is beside the point that the Soviet diplomacy has no mediation experience in world affairs. Such a vacuum is filled here with energy and the calculating mind of academic Primakov, sent by Nobel Peace Price winner of this year President Mikhail Gorbachev first to the Gulf countries, including Iraq, and later to four Western capitals.

A good outcome of the mission by the Soviet president's envoy may be prevented by the present development of the much deeper Gulf crisis now. Some people believe that the tense standoff in the Gulf zone has reached such an emotional level when no one any longer gives thought to the negotiating table. It is increasingly difficult to imagine that troops of the United States and some other countries within the multinational force, whose passion for fighting is kept up by endless exercises, would pack up their field guns and move home from Saudi Arabia. The machine for preparing a military strike on Iraq has been moving too fast to stop it and reverse its movement. The olive branch will no longer bring to a halt the moving tank caterpillar.

Politics are an art of the possible; to some extent the art is known by Yevgeniy Primakov himself and by those leaders he has lately talked with, starting with Saddam Husayn and ending with George Bush. The war of nerves linked with Gulf crisis could have a negative effect on the restraint and patience of some policymakers, who are now more inclined to launch an invasion then to carry on the confrontation.

During a visit to Moscow last week the United States Secretary of Defense Richard Cheney said the American military doctrine must provide in the future for the Pentagon's involvement in multinational forces deployed in hotspots around the world. The issue may be raised in this way only if a war against Iraq is already a settled matter. I cannot believe, writes Mikhail Mayorov,

that Yevgeniy Primakov, though he is a skilled politician, has played a magician's role on his overseas mission and produced from his hat one rabbit after another, but I believe in something else: someone needed to try to lay bridges between Baghdad and other capitals, and that this initiative is rather better than the steady advancement toward the abyss of a war.

Chances for peace in the Persian Gulf are diminishing with each passing day, but they still exist, writes our commentator Mikhail Mayorov, expressing his personal views. Saddam Husayn knows this better than anyone else, since he dreamed he saw the prophet Muhammad, to take for granted what the Arab press is saying, and the prophet recommended to him moves in the spirit of the United Nations Security Council decisions.

UN Supervision Seen as Deterrent to Aggression

PM2210110390 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 19 Oct 90 First Edition p 3

[Article by KRASNAYA ZVEZDA observer Aleksandr Golts under the "World Today: Problems and Opinions" rubric: "Lessons for Tomorrow"]

[Text] Now, two months or so after the Iraqi aggression began, it is becoming increasingly obvious that it was not only Kuwait, not only the hundreds and thousands of innocent people who were its victims. The hope that with the elimination of East-West military confrontation mankind would really approach a secure and civilized world was also its victim. Events have demonstrated most obviously that the cessation of Soviet-U.S. rivalry does not mean that all other states will unfailingly follow the great powers' example. Particularly those in the so-called "Third World." The desire there is still great to resolve internal clashes and external conflicts by force.

I by no means intend to belittle the significance of the fact that from the beginning of the aggression Moscow and Washington found common approaches to this problem. Approaches that ensured our countries' effective collaboration in the international arena. Certainly, the whole world has seen that the two great powers have abandoned their former dogmas. However, the unparalleled unity within the UN Security Council did not make the aggressor see sense. By and large it must be said that the world community has proved ill-prepared to cope with such situations. Yet there are still plenty of "hot spots" in the world, moreover some possible participants in conflicts of this kind have military potential similar to that at Saddam Husayn's disposal.

That is why we should sum up the preliminary results now, when the Gulf crisis is still far from being solved. The time has come to reflect on difficult questions. For instance, is the world community's current reaction to the Iraqi aggression the best answer? How should states act in order to prevent a repetition of this situation in the future?

It is well-known that the UN announcement of economic sanctions and the deployment of the armed forces of 20 or so states in the Persian Gulf was the response to Baghdad's invasion of Kuwait. As for military action, we should recognize that the Pentagon was the best prepared for actions of this kind both conceptually and purely practically. On the one hand, throughout the last decade U.S. strategists have been vigorously working out scenarios for a whole range of low-intensity conflicts: from anti-insurgent operations to local warfare to protect vital American interests (incidentally, the Persian Gulf region was regarded from the outset as a sphere where such interests exist). This work resulted in directive documents, regulations, and instructions under which troop training was organized.

On the other hand, the U.S. President also had a considerable military contingent designed for such operations—the rapid deployment forces—at his disposal. A special organizational structure was set up—the Central Command [Centcom]. The U.S. press believes that Centcom's role in U.S. strategic planning will henceforth increase appreciably.

At the same time it is striking that the House of Representatives has already proposed allocating the Pentagon more funds next year than previously intended. What is more, congressmen demanded the revival of a number of military programs that the Pentagon itself seemed to have given up as a bad job. It is, in particular, a question of new military transport aircraft and VTOL [vertical takeoff and landing] fighters—that is, hardware which may be needed in regional conflicts. In other words, events in the Gulf have given a spurt to military preparations in the United States which quite recently were being curtailed.

One is bound to point out that, as the situation in the Persian Gulf worsens, NATO discussions about changes in strategy have become quite definite. "It is extremely likely that the southern flank—the Mediterranean and Aegean Seas, along with Turkey, will ultimately be the forward position for us," REUTER cites a prominent NATO diplomat. In his opinion, the North Atlantic bloc is taking steps to ensure that contemporary military hardware, particularly tanks that are no longer needed in Central Europe, is redeployed to the southern flank. The report points out that considerable contingents of rapid deployment forces may be set up for operations in this area.

But this is a thing of the future. At present the North Atlantic bloc does not have the right to operate outside its zone of responsibility as defined in 1949. That is why every NATO country has had to send its military contingents to the Persian Gulf region on an individual basis. It is not NATO but the Western European Union [WEU], which incorporates most NATO European countries (this union's activity has no geographical restrictions), that will provide the necessary coordination for their operations.

It was by WEU decision that operational groups of specialists from the member countries' military and diplomatic departments have now been formed. These groups have undertaken to coordinate the operations undertaken by West European countries' armed forces in the conflict area. On their recommendation the naval groupings' commanders have already allocated zones of responsibility and patrol areas. These groups' actions will also extend to ground units and air forces. The mobilization of WEU activity in this area is bound to affect the situation in Europe—it is, after all, a question of reviving a closed military grouping.

Whereas the European countries are broadening their military functions, as it seems to me, without particular enthusiasm, the idea is seen differently in Tokyo. People there have seen in the crisis the sought-after excuse to bypass the provision of their own Constitution. Namely the provisions which say that the "Self-Defense Forces" cannot be used anywhere apart from on their own territory. The Japanese cabinet has just approved a draft law permitting servicemen to be used in operations "in support of the United Nations." However, many people in Asian countries fear that Tokyo will be able to exploit this precedent to justify other, not so noble, military actions abroad.

Now we come to a quite interesting element. The troop deployment has not made Baghdad withdraw its troops from Kuwait. At the same time it has generated fresh problems. There are no doubts on the whole as to the legality of the multinational forces' actions. Nevertheless (this is obviously the specific public view of a concentration of major foreign forces) many people who condemn the Iraqi aggression are at the same time developing doubts: Are the states that have sent troops pursuing other aims in addition to their avowed aims.

"Today," as respected a politician as R. Gandhi points out in analyzing U.S. actions, "we are faced with a situation whereby a great power is deciding how problems should be settled. The world community should not be pushed into such a decision. But that is precisely what is happening, and it represents a kind of indicator for the future. Are we not heading for a situation where one country will tell the whole world how to resolve its problems? Will we not reach a point where one country or group of countries appoints itself the world's policeman?"

I am not sure that such fears are warranted. But one is bound to take into consideration the fact that they are quite widespread. That is why the hasty deployment of armed forces and the equally hasty tailoring of military concepts to fit the new situation—this prompt and forced response to aggression—cannot be considered the optimum response. That is why I cannot agree with those people who admit the possibility of the USSR's joining the multinational forces.

The task today is above all to create mechanisms to prevent aggression. The United Nations should have a say here. Practice has shown that the concept of defense sufficiency has ceased to be a diplomatic abstraction. Quite concrete figures can be laid down for every country both in terms of armed forces and arms. USSR Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze stressed that the world community must supervise states' military might, weapons shipments, and military technology transfer. Those countries which deliberately build up their offensive potential must be placed under special supervision.

Even now, when Washington is repenting the fact that it supplied Iraq with American technology, the administration is still trying to get permission from the Congress to continue military shipments to Pakistan—a country which refuses to confirm that it is not producing nuclear weapons. Has the Gulf crisis really taught them nothing?

However, I am not so naive as to think that an aggressor can be stopped just by proclaiming certain principles of defense sufficiency. International law-enforcement organs capable of forcibly preventing banditry will be needed in the future. Only they must not be housed in the Pentagon or on the Arbat. The UN Security Council and Military Staff Committee should assume this role. The latter's tasks include working out the practical aspects of putting national troop contingents at the Security Council's disposal. These international forces—in the full sense of the term—will be seen quite differently in the public mind from those currently operating in the Persian Gulf.

Structures have to be set up now that can ensure the security of all members of the world community in the future. That is the main lesson for tomorrow.

Belorussian Minister Speaks on UN IAEA Report

LD2310221590 Moscow TASS in English 2147 GMT 23 Oct 90

[By TASS correspondent Mikhail Kochetkov]

[Text] United Nations October 23 TASS—The impact of the Gulf crisis on the world's oil market again is raising the issue whether nations should rely still more on nuclear power engineering, Hans Blix, director-general of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), said today.

He was speaking at the 45th session of the U.N. General Assembly, which has begun a debate on the IAEA's annual report.

Blix spoke in detail about the system of IAEA guarantees on nuclear reactors in various countries. He said this system is constantly developing and inspires confidence that nuclear activity is being conducted only for peaceful purposes.

The system, which was created 30 years ago, now covers 922 installations, including nuclear reactors, or 95 per cent of all such facilities in countries not possessing nuclear weapons, Blix said. The IAEA seeks to increase

the number of countries in which nuclear installations are under international control.

Blix called for reducing the discharge of carbon dioxide into the atmosphere, which leads to a global warming, and for developing nuclear power engineering.

Nuclear power plants now generate about 17 per cent of the world's electricity. Hydroelectric power plants generate a little more.

Britain generates about 70 per cent of its electricity by burning coal. This is why carbon dioxide discharges into the atmosphere in that country are 10 times higher than in France, where more than 70 per cent of electricity is generated by nuclear power plants, the IAEA chief said.

He said that the agency is stepping up efforts to ensure safety in nuclear power engineering and solve the problem of burying nuclear waste.

The IAEA thoroughly analysed the Chernobyl nuclear power plant accident and is now studying its radioloical consequences, Blix said.

Many U.N. bodies and specialised agencies should render assistance in studying this issue and working out protection measures.

Conclusions by technical missions that gathered necessary information in accident-stricken areas will soon be analysed and efficient measures will be worked out to reduce the consequences of the accident, Blix said.

The foreign minister of Belorussia, who participated in the debate, today proposed creating a nuclear-free belt in the Soviet Union's western areas.

Petr Kravchenko told the General Assembly that the belt could include Belorussia, the Ukraine and the Baltic republics, which could be joined by countries of central Europe, if they wished.

He said this proposal was a follow-up of the Soviet Union's initiative towards turning the Baltic into a nuclear-free zone and proposals by central European countries for creating zones of reduced military activity in their regions.

"Belorussia intends to ensure that steps to implement this task do not infringe on anyone's legitimate security interests and stability on the whole of the continent," Kravchenko said.

"Belorussia is particularly interested in extending the IAEA programme on the safety of all kinds of nuclear facilities, above all nuclear power plants. The topicality of such activity is growing because of the ageing of nuclear facilities and the growing risk of accidents due to this."

The foreign minister spoke in detail about the Chernobyl accident. He said that 70 per cent of the radioisotopes from the Chernobyl reactor landed on Belorussia and contaminated one-third of its territory.

"Twenty per cent of the republic's population, or 2,200,000 people, have become innocent victims of Chernobyl," Kravchenko said.

"New spots of radioactive contamination continue to be detected. Efforts to decontaminate areas fail to produce required results. Radionuclides are spreading all over the republic, threatening to exceed its boundaries.

"The reality does not correspond to earlier-made forecasts by Soviet and foreign experts at all."

Kravchenko said that Belorussia was taking emergency measures.

"The republic has also appealed on the world community for help and is now grateful for international solidarity and assistance." he said, adding that the assistance "has been coming largely through non-governmental channels".

Kravchenko proposed setting up a Chernobyl fund to finance programmes for international cooperation and assistance. He said the fund's board could be composed of prominent politicians, scientists and cultural personalities.

He also proposed declaring April 26, when the Chernobyl accident occurred, the international day for the prevention of nuclear and other industrial accidents.

The Soviet Union believes that the potential of the Non-Proliferation Treaty has not been exhausted.

The treaty should operate until a nuclear-free and non-violent world becomes a reality, Soviet representative Sergey Batsanov said today during the debate of a report by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) at the 45th U.N. General Assembly.

The prohibition of nuclear tests is an important element of the non-proliferation and elimination of nuclear weapons. The USSR was and remains a firm supporter of the earliest possible implementation of this measure, he stressed.

"We have reviewed our programme for nuclear tests in 1989, cutting their number and yields. We have stopped explosions since last October altogether.

"Moreover, we are ready to make this year-long internal final and eternal. For this purpose, it is enough for the U.S. Government to cancel its programmes of nuclear tests unilaterally or on the basis of a mutual understanding," Batsanov noted.

The Soviet Union advocates banning the production of fissionable materials for weapons' manufacture and plans, by the year 2000, to close down all reactors producing plutonium for this purpose.

United States & Canada

U.S.-Soviet Gulf Cooperation Surveyed

PM1910101190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 14 Oct 90 Morning Edition p 5

["Viewpoint" by Aleksey Pushkov: "Shoulder to Shoulder with America?"]

[Text] For the first time since World War II, the USSR and the United States are acting jointly against an aggressor. Hitherto they had acted mainly like former adversaries embarked on reconciliation. They are now laying the foundations for real partnership in the world arena. "...We are acting together to build new relations," George Bush told Congress after meeting Mikhail Gorbachev in Helsinki. "Yes, we are keeping in step with the Soviets," confirmed U.S. Secretary of State Baker.

So, our champions of "unshakeable foundations" and "basic principles" will retort, the Americans are praising us again, which means there is something behind it—we have again started toeing their line. Okay, every one is entitled to his own opinion, although it is desirable nevertheless that it accord with the facts. I would only remind you that ideology and politics, which have prompted us for all kinds of reasons and sometimes for no reason at all to oppose the United States or the entire West, have already led us into an historical deadend. We have too often and unthinkingly rushed to support anti-Western forces in various regions, disregarding our own security interests and the needs of our own people.

Who calculates how many resources have been spent helping those forces and so-called progressive regimes which turned away from us once they had made use of our help? There are examples enough: Egypt under Sadat, Somalia under Siad Barre. The anti-American and anti-Western thrust of the policy of Third World countries can be no guarantee of either their progressiveness or the durability of our ties with them. On the contrary, this thrust is too often coupled with an antidemocratic and dictatorial internal policy and utter contempt for human rights, the norms of international law, and their own peoples.

Our former watchword "America's enemy is our friend" was misguided from the outset and inevitably spent its force. The present episode with Iraq confronts us, incidentally, with a special and very acute question concerning the nature of our relations with third-world countries, which became our allies basically as a result of the logic of the cold war. I do not want to say thereby that we should now form a bloc with the West in all cases.

Today, when our policy is ceasing to be determined by ideological axioms, we should correlate it above all with our country's national interests. What, then, does our switching to partnership with the United States give us?

Above all it serves to overcome an important psychological and political barrier in relations with it. A highly skeptical attitude to the possibilities of real foreign policy cooperation with the USSR had hitherto prevailed there.

I recall a discussion in the U.S Department of State last winter. One of the leaders of the policy planning department then warned me against undue optimism in assessing the potential for Soviet-U.S. collaboration. The sphere of coincidence of U.S. and Soviet interests is not so great, he assured me. It amounts to the joint fight against terrorism and the spread of narcotics and arms control. It is premature to talk about cooperation, he insisted, there is little that actually unites the USSR and the United States.

Clearly out of professional caution, the experienced diplomat made no reference at the time to cooperation in resolving regional conflicts. But it is clear today that it is precisely here that Soviet-U.S. partnership can be highly productive.

This is now acknowledged by Bush. It was he, incidentally, who initiated the meeting with the Soviet president. It turns out that the United States also needs the Soviet Union. The thesis of the interdependence and interlacing interests of the two powers has been fully borne out. "Without Soviet support," the INTERNATIONAL HERALD TRIBUNE comments, "Bush would not have been able to assert that it is not a case of the United States opposing the Arab world in the Gulf but rather of the whole international community opposing Husayn."

It is no secret that Bush has begun to regard the idea of economic assistance to the USSR more positively since Helsinki.

Does this mean that Moscow is "buying" Washington's economic aid by its stance on the Persian Gulf? I do not think that the question can be put that way. I am also sure that economic problems were not discussed by Bush and Gorbachev from such a standpoint. But it is only natural that deepening mutual understanding and the new degree of trust that exists between the two leaders should make the U.S. Administration better disposed in its approach to questions of economic contacts with the USSR.

Of course, in the context of the vast U.S. budgetary deficit, it is difficult to hope for major financial transfusions from it. Nor should the potential for trade development be overestimated: According to U.S. forecasts, in the next two years it will at best increase to $6 billion, which is not a lot, even though it will mean a 100-percent increase.

Nevertheless, any improvement in political dialogue with the United States is economically very important for us. The United States plays the leading role in such financial institutions as GATT and the IMF and holds the largest parcel of shares in the World Bank, which the USSR also intends to join. Whereas, from the domestic standpoint, the route to reintegration in the world

economy lies for us in a a return to the market, on the foreign front it lies in economic rapprochment with the United States, West Europe, and the new industrial countries.

Moreover, in the light of recent events, such contacts are assuming a new importance for Americans. The crisis in the region from where the United States has obtained a large proportion of the oil consumed in the country, and the sharp rise in oil prices (it has leapt to $40 per barrel in the United States) have prompted some U.S. specialists to look again at the possibility of cooperating with the USSR. In their opinion, purchases of Soviet oil would make it possible to sustain the U.S. market and reduce U.S. dependence on Near East sources and OPEC countries altogether. "Oil could turn old rivals into new friends," THE CHICAGO TRIBUNE comments. Iraq's seizure of Kuwait, the newspaper comments, "has brought the United States and the USSR even closer together politically and could do the same for the superpowers on the economic plane."

It was no accident that a delegation of U.S. oil corporation leaders accompanied Secretary of Commerce Mosbacher on his recent visit to Moscow. As the well-informed magazine BUSINESS WEEK reports, such giants of the U.S. power industry as Arco, Chevron, and Texaco are already studying the possibility of investing in the Soviet oil industry by setting up joint ventures. There is also talk that the administration is trying to persuade Congress to review existing limitations on the sale of oil-drilling technology to the Soviet Union.

True, we do not have enough oil ourselves today, production is declining. But not because there is too little of it: Known reserves amount to around six percent of world stocks, or more than 60 billion barrels, which is more than double the U.S. oil stocks. Nor is it because we are selling too much of it—only one-third of the total oil extracted is exported. The reasons lie elsewhere—in the Soviet oil industry's obsolete base, the extreme inefficiency of oil consumption in the country (on average twice as much energy is expended per unit of output than in the West), and in the absence of technology to develop a number of new remote fields. Losses due to the crude exploitation of deposits are also large.

Cooperation with U.S. companies in the exploration of new fields, the use of their capital and technology, and the acquisition of energy-saving equipment could in time, I think, help us overcome the present decline in oil extraction, improve the situation regarding energy resources in the country, and even increase their supply to the West. Of course, mindful of how irresponsibly and often incompetently contracts with Western partners are concluded in this country, and also in view of the importance of this raw material to it, we must calculate our own interests very rigorously, possibly even submitting major draft contracts for expert appraisal by the independent commissions set up under Supreme Soviet supervision. But here time is of the essence. The increased interest shown in us by U.S. business and the favorable conditions in the world oil market require us to respond quickly. Are we capable of doing so?

Whereas our foreign policy is removing obstacles to cooperation with the West, including the United States, and is building up trust in us there, our internal disorder, economic muddle, growth of separatism, and crisis of power are gradually eroding it. The future of the Soviet Union itself as a state formation is becoming increasingly unclear. "What kind of partners are we dealing with?"—asks U.S. political expert Helmut Sonnenfeldt. "Can they all still sign agreements, adopt arms control treaties, and vote in the UN Security Council?" All this, not to mention the extremely unfavorable conditions for foreign capital investments, undermines our reliability as partners and makes it difficult for us to obtain real benefit from the improvement in political realations with the West.

Now for our international position: Do we not weaken our influence in the third world, particularly in Arab countries, by acting in tandem with the United States? Does this not strike at our ties with allies and our international prestige?

Above all, Soviet-U.S. agreement on the Persian Gulf and indeed on a broader plane has led to increasing activity on the part of the Security Council and the United Nations as a whole. At last, after a long period of crisis in the organization, people have begun talking of its revival. Meanwhile we continue to play a central role in it. And surely the increasing effectiveness of its activity, which was previously blocked in effect by East-West confrontation, is increasing our political opportunities and international prestige.

Moreover, at Helsinki the United States relinquished a very important principle of its whole Near East policy—"keeping the Russians as far outside the region as possible." If one of its authors, Henry Kissinger, had not been alive, U.S. journalist Tom Wicker grimly joked, he would have turned in his grave. The Bush Administration is now stating that the USSR must take part without fail in the future security structure in the Near East. A chance for constructive collaboration between the two countries on another conflict—the Arab-Israeli conflict—has arisen. Having sacrificed our military links and "special relations" with Iraq, which even before were not smooth, we have expanded our range of political influence upon the situation in the region.

In the Arab world the reaction to our behavior is highly contradictory, ranging from Saudi Arabia's establishment of diplomatic relations with us to actual allegations of "collusion" with the United States. In the event of war in the Persian Gulf we, for all our disagreements with the Americans regarding the ways and means of resolving the crisis, could perfectly well be regarded there as enemies of the Arabs. In any event it is clearly essential that we continue to define our approaches in a consistent but careful and well-considered manner, seeking invariably to bring UN potential into effect. Our position

contains quite a lot of attractive features for the Arab countries, particularly our negative attitude to the possibility of a permanent U.S. military presence in the region, where peace and stability must be maintained first and foremost by the Arab states.

As far as our alliance relations, in this case with Iraq, are concerned, they do have limits. It was Iraq itself that compelled us to take up our present position. We were never committed to supporting its aggression against an independent neighboring country or even to remain neutral toward such aggression. And do we need such an ally?

Let us sum up. Together with the transition to the market, the transition to partnership with the United States could perfectly well be the start of a great leap forward in Soviet-U.S. political and economic contacts. Cooperation in the UN Security Council has already resulted in substantial and possibly crucial progress at the Soviet-U.S. arms reduction talks. On the international plane, in the opinion of many, a transition to a new world order has in general emerged. "Bush and Gorbachev have made effective use of the opportunity for a practical demonstration of how the world could function in the postcold-war era," is the opinion of the well-known U.S. commentator Anthony Lewis.

But for all this, we have in no way turned into friends or allies of the United States. Across the Atlantic, we have too long been regarded as the main security threat for this to recede quickly into the past. Indeed, the USSR is no longer considered there as a direct enemy. But that is only just beginning to affect actual military-strategic planning. The United States is in no way abandoning its ideas on national security, it continues to modernize its Armed Forces, and is ready to cut only obviously superfluous items of military expenditure. There should, I think, be no illusions on this score.

Nor should excessive hopes be pinned upon the new world order. The old problems and conflicts in the world are being replaced by others. It is very important that the USSR and the United States lay down the foundations for expanding cooperation in order to settle international crises. Will they be able to keep to this path? And is it within their powers to solve existing and future conflicts in the third world which, according to forecasts, will abound in the nineties? Can they curb the aggressive "local superpowers" which are coming into being, and avoid new wars? But let us not look too far into the future. The development of events in the Persian Gulf will provide the first answers to these questions.

TASS Reports U.S. To Send Tanks to Saudi Arabia

LD2010122890 Moscow TASS in English 1141 GMT 20 Oct 90

[By correspondent Pavel Vanichkin]

[Text] Washington October 20 TASS—The United States plans to shift over 500 M-1A1 tanks from Western Europe to Saudi Arabia, Pentagon officials reported on Friday. M-1A1 tanks are designed to be used under conditions of chemical and bacteriological warfare.

There are about 250,000 American troops and some 800 U.S. tanks in Saudi Arabia. However, the CBS TV company reports that Pentagon specialists believe that the strength of troops and armaments is not enough for a successful offensive against Iraq.

Therefore, they are examining a possibility of moving another two tank divisions to the region.

Political Constraints on U.S. Gulf Action Noted

91UF0061A Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 17 Oct 90 First Edition p 3

[Article by candidate of historical sciences S. Samuilov: "The President's Options"]

[Text] The buildup of the opposing military forces in the Persian Gulf continues. American troops constitute, as is known, the nucleus of the international forces. Clearly, in the event of the start of combat operations, it is the Americans who would bear the brunt of the confrontation with the Iraqi Army. And in this case the White House would have not only to proceed from the actual strategic situation but take account of other factors also. However odd this may seem, such factors are for the United States its form of government, the separation of powers, and the military authority—which is quite strictly regulated—ensuing therefrom.

I would recall that because of the Vietnam war American society was in a state of acute domestic political crisis in the 1970's. This was not without its effects either for society or the political leadership. Overriding a presidential veto, in November 1973, Congress passed the War Powers Act. Politically, it was aimed at reducing to a minimum—if not excluding altogether by way of considerable limitation of—the President's military prerogatives, the possibility of a repetition of "new Vietnams"; that is, protracted participation in regional conflicts.

The act sets strict time limits within which the President, as commander in chief of the Armed Forces, may exercise their combat use overseas without the approval of Congress. Yes, the President retained the right to use at his discretion without a declaration of war (according to the American Constitution, this right is reserved to Congress) the U.S. Armed Forces in combat operations overseas, merely having notified Congress of this in writing within the first 48 hours of an operation. However, in accordance with the act, the President is required within 60 days to have returned the troops to the United States, if in this time Congress has not declared war, or has not approved other combat use of the Armed Forces, or if it simply has been unable to assemble on account of an attack on the United States.

The prolongation of any local war is fraught for the White House with the danger of a loss of support of both

the public and the Congress. Only short-term operations that are obviously "condemned to succeed" may be supported in the United States currently. All that has been said is applicable to the present situation in the Persian Gulf also. The "Vietnam syndrome" is being manifested in Americans' attitude toward the possibility of a military confrontation with Iraq. Recent polls show that 69 percent of the country's populace supports a continuation of the economic blockade of Iraq. As far as combat operations are concerned, the situation here is different. A readiness to support full-scale retaliatory military operations in the event of an Iraqi attack on Saudi Arabia was expressed by only 47 percent of those polled, that is, less than half. The vast majority is opposed to the United States' use of weapons of mass destruction to achieve victory. And this despite Iraq's threats to use chemical weapons.

It should be added to this that, although the House of Representatives passed a resolution in support of the President's policy in the Persian Gulf (which also, incidentally, emphasizes the use of "diplomatic and nonmilitary means" in a settlement of the crisis), relations between the White House and Congress in respect to this crisis are far from cloudless. In particular, Congress has started an investigation to ascertain why the R. Reagan and G. Bush administrations granted Saddam Husayn military and economic assistance. An investigation has been conducted also as to whether the White House correctly interpreted at the end of this July Iraq's signals concerning a possible invasion of Kuwait. Today these seem like blips in the relations of Capitol Hill and the White House, but in the event of military operations, they could be a serious problem for the President.

It is obvious here that a possible military confrontation with Iraq would be far from a "stroll," like the punishment of Grenada and Panama. Iraq has an entirely modern, strong Army with the combat experience of a long war. According to Western estimates, it has chemical and, possibly, bacteriological weapons. According to the latest Pentagon calculations, in the event of an American invasion of Kuwait, the United States could at the outset of a war with Iraq lose about 4,000 killed and 16,000 wounded.

Hence the conclusion that in the event of a choice in favor of the military path of a solution of the crisis in the Persian Gulf, President G. Bush should look for a rapid escalation of combat operations. It is highly likely that it is such tasks that are set by Operation Night Camel, which the French magazine L'EXPRESS recently reported and which the Pentagon is disavowing in every possible way. But it is this path that will lead to the increased danger of the war outgrowing a regional framework and the creation of a threat to the whole world. And this cannot be permitted.

House Approves Intelligence Appropriations Bill

PM2110135190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Oct 90 Second Edition p 5

[PRAVDA-TASS report: "From the Flood of News": "United States"]

[Text] 19 Oct—The U.S. House of Representatives has approved a bill on appropriations for intelligence activity in 1991. Specific levels of spending on intelligence programs have been kept secret; however, THE WASHINGTON POST announced that they total roughly $29 billion. These funds have been allocated to the National Security Agency, the Defense Intelligence Agency, the CIA, and the National Intelligence Agency [as published], which is involved in the development of spy satellites.

U.S. President's Assistant Visits Kaluga

LD1910201290 Moscow TASS in English 1542 GMT 19 Oct 90

[By TASS correspondent Yuriy Solyanikov]

[Text] Kaluga October 19 TASS—Nicholas Goncharov, assistant to the U.S. President for economic relations with the USSR and East European countries, on Thursday visited Polotnyany Zavod, a small town in the Kaluga region, south of Moscow.

Goncharov is a descendant of the family that owned the linen mill, which gave the name to the town. Natalia Goncharova, who married Russian poet Aleksandr Pushkin, also belonged to this family. Before the October Revolution Polotnyany Zavod belonged to the Goncharovs, having been granted to them by Peter the Great. The paper mill is now situated in the town. The Goncharovs' house is being restored.

Recently Micholas Goncharov has been trying to augment East-West contacts and working to revive spiritual culture and uncover historic roots.

He used this visit to the land of his ancestors to sign a protocol of intent to revive and preserve national traditions, specially, to set up an arts and crafts musuem and restore the Goncharov estate at Polotnyany Zavod.

The other party to the protocol is Provintsia Ltd., the society that invited Goncharov to Kaluga. This recently formed society seeks to establish contacts with Western businessmen and ensure the province's economic revival.

Official Speaks at U.S. Publishers' Forum

PM2310120190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Oct 90 First Edition p 5

[Article by PRAVDA correspondent V. Linnik: "Publishers' Forum"]

[Excerpts] New York, 21 Oct—The annual convention of the Association of American Publishers, which unites hundreds of large and small firms in the United States, has ended here.... Despite the cold breath of the advancing economic recession, publishing in the United States remains a flourishing business. [passage omitted]

A delegation from the USSR State Committee for the Press headed by D.F. Mamleyev, its first deputy chairman, took part in the work of the convention. "We already have established business ties with Western, including U.S., publishers," he said. "The magazines BUSINESSWEEK and NEW FARMER are published in Russian. Barnes and Noble would like to open a book store in Moscow. New contracts are being concluded and there is an active search for partners and a study of the market." In a press release issued here someone noted that we must wait about 30 years for the development of Soviet-U.S. business contacts—so unfavorable is the political situation in the USSR, he claims. "I adhere to a different opinion," I was told by D. Kammerfeld [name as transliterated], president of the Association of American Publishers. "Contacts must be developed. The desire and opportunities for this exist on both sides in my opinion."

Northeast Asia

Japanese Intentions in Gulf Worries Neighbors

LD2310193490 Moscow TASS in English 1902 GMT 23 Oct 90

[By TASS news analyst Askold Biryukov]

[Text] Moscow October 23 TASS—Judging by reports from Tokyo, Japanese military circles and politicians from the ruling Liberal-Democratic Party have decided to use the Gulf crisis to make a breakthrough in economic and military-political terms on the international scene.

The Japanese Government's persistent efforts to push through parliament a bill that would allow it to dispatch abroad servicemen from the Japanese "self-defence" forces is evidence of this intention.

The key element of the bill is to create a corps for a peaceful assistance to the United Nations, which sparked a stormy debate in the Japanese parliament and society, is a clear attempt to lift the ban on sending Japanese Armed Forces abroad, which has been in effect in Japan for dozens of years.

The Japanese press evaluated the government's actions as an attempt to do away with the constitution, which prohibits Japan from using force or creating Armed Forces for this purpose.

During a public opinion poll, the overwhelming majority of the Japanese opposed the idea of sending Japanese Armed Forces to the Gulf. Many observers in that country think that under the pretext of a need to help the United Nations, Tokyo is out to increase Japan's power sharply by turning it into a power with Armed Forces equivalent to the country's economic might.

The public, press and official circles in countries neighbouring on Japan have expressed the same thoughts.

A Chinese Foreign Ministry spokesman in Beijing called upon Tokyo to act with the utmost caution. He said that the aggressive war unleashed by Japanese militarism in the past inflicted tremendous hardships—still vividly remembered—on the Chinese people and the peoples of other Asian countries. China repeatedly said it wanted the Japanese Government to take these factors into account. Otherwise, Japan's action will injure the feelings of Asian peoples and ultimately damage Japan itself, the Chinese spokesman emphasised in a XINHUA interview.

According to South Korean Foreign Minister Choe Ho-Chung, the dispatch of Japanese servicemen abroad may help turn Japan into a future military power. Choe said that in Seoul they closely followed the debate on the aforementioned bill in the Japanese Parliament and were prepared to express their concern in Tokyo officially.

The Philippine foreign minister also voiced serious worries about the prospect of Japan's revival as a military power in Asia. He told journalists that the whole world and especially the Philippines, which was seized by Japan during the Second World War, was concerned about Tokyo increased military preparations.

Thai news analyst Kawi Chongkittavorn writes that the dispatch of Japanese "self-defence forces" to the Gulf could serve as a beginning. They could then be dispatched to Southeast Asia—Cambodia—setting off increasing protests in Asian and Pacific countries. The Japanese actions and genocide during the Second World War remain alive in the memory of their peoples.

Concern that Japan, an economic giant, will begin to play a military role in the region runs deep in countries that neighbour on Japan. Tokyo would be short-sighted to turn a blind eye to this concern. This stance would make null and voice continuous assurances on the part of Japanese officials that they respect the interests of the Asian-Pacific countries.

Soviet-Japanese Spaceflight Scheduled 2 Dec

LD2310194690 Moscow TASS in English 1929 GMT 23 Oct 90

[By TASS correspondent Rena Kuznetsova]

[Text] Moscow October 23 TASS—Preparations for a Soviet-Japanese space flight have begun at the Soviet Union's Baykonur launching site, a spokesman for the Soviet Glavkosmos space agency told TASS.

Two Japanese journalists—Toyehiro Akiyama and Rioko Kikuchi of the TBS radio and television network—are preparing for the flight with a soviet crew to the soviet Mir space station at the cosmonauts' training centre near Moscow.

The take-off is scheduled for December 2.

Aleksey Leonov, deputy head of the training centre, told TASS that both Japanese contenders for the place in the Soviet spaceship are "self-disciplined and studious."

A Soviet state commission will decide which of the two will fly to Mir on the eve of the flight.

Special pavilions are being built at Baykonur for guests and reporters. The take-off is planned to be broadcast live.

Part of the scientific equipment to be used by the Soviet-Japanese crew during their eight-day mission has already been taken to Mir by an unmanned cargo spacecraft.

'Positive Shifts' Seen in Inter-Korean Ties

PM2310142990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Oct 90 First Edition p 5

[Report by PRAVDA correspondent S. Tikhomirov under the rubric: "Topic of the Day": "Will the Grandchildren Be Able To Come?"]

[Text] Pyongyang—The haste with which the Republic of Korea delegation headed by Prime Minister Kang Yong-hun left Pyongyang, "without paying their respects" to correspondents accredited in Pyongyang, to tell the truth, somewhat puzzled journalists. It falls to them to look for an explanation of why the train carrying the South Koreans toward the 38th Parallel vanished into the distance half an hour earlier than scheduled.

The second, Pyongyang, round of talks between the heads of the governments of North and South Korea lasted about six hours in all. Unfortunately, this time the two sides reached no specific accords. The agenda was extremely wide, although it can be fitted into two lines of print, which read as follows: "Removal of the military-political confrontation between North and South; multifaceted cooperation and exchanges."

Discussion of these questions began back in Seoul at the end of last month during the visit of a North Korean delegation headed by Yon Hyong-muk, premier of the DPRK Administration Council. And now the Pyongyang meeting has taken place. It appeared that neither the South nor the North was expecting a serious breakthrough at the talks. How else to explain the fact that most of the delegation's stay in Pyongyang was devoted to sightseeing in the city, visiting the circus, the Palace of Pioneers, stadiums, and so forth. Only six hours were allotted to the negotiating table. I think that this too predetermined the outcome of the talks.

The two sides reasserted their positions on such key questions, at least from Pyongyang's viewpoint, as the fate of South Korean citizens who visited the DPRK without the sanction of the authorities and who are to this day serving prison sentences; the holding of the annual U.S.-South Korean "Team Spirit" maneuvers; and UN membership. Seoul believes that the convicted people broke the law and therefore their punishment is just. South Korea has not changed its attitude to "Team Spirit," or to the problem of both Koreas' UN membership.

Nevertheless there are some positive shifts of position. This applies primarily to the possible conclusion of a joint declaration which would concern, among other things, disarmament and an end to the arms race on the peninsula; solving conflict situations by peaceful means; and developing economic and humanitarian cooperation. Each side presented its own draft of the future declaration—perhaps a first basic document which could regulate Pyongyang-Seoul relations. The contents of the two documents are, both sides acknowledge, virtually identical.

However, the declaration was not signed. The reason is the divergence of views on what it should be called. The key word which the North proposed for the "title" was "nonaggression." The South insisted on "reconciliation and peace." In the upshot, the signing of the document was postponed "until more favorable times." These times, if nothing unforeseen happens, are due to come some time in the middle of December when, under a preliminary accord, a DPRK delegation will again depart for Seoul. Incidentally, this accord is another not unimportant result of the talks, insomuch as it was unclear until the last moment whether the premiers' dialogue would continue.

One thing is in no doubt—the shrapnel of the Cold War lodged firmly in the body of the Korean peninsula is nowadays like an iceberg which finds itself in the rapid, warm currents of international politics. And Korea's future depends on how great is the mutual desire of Pyongyang and Seoul to see this iceberg thaw; on this also depends whether the grandchildren of the South Korean premier, who is a native of the North, will be able to visit their grandfather's homeland in the foreseeable future.

Historian on PRC Participation in Korean War

SK1810233590 Moscow International Service in Korean 0900 GMT 17 Oct 90

[Text] This month marks the 40th anniversary of the participation of the Chinese People's Volunteers [CPV] in the Korean war. Participating in this radio program is (Viktor Usov), junior doctor in history, senior academician of the Far East Institute under the USSR Academy of Sciences.

According to the Chinese reference compilation science up to the early 1980's, the CPV began to participate in

the Korean war on 25 October 1950. However, after the publication of the Recollection of Marshal Peng Dehuai, commander of the CPV, it has been made clear that this event took place on 19 October. The majority of the Chinese historians agreed with Marshal Peng Dehuai, citing facts. It seems that the date 25 October has something to do with the first victory the CPV scored over the Syngman Rhee's army.

At first the Chinese leadership planned to participate in the Korean war on 13 October, but postponed it one week because Stalin rejected the preliminary agreement. According to the preliminary agreement, the Soviet Union was supposed to support the CPV from the air. Despite the delay in the Soviet air support, Mao Zedong decided not to postpone the Chinese intervention in the war any more, because if he had done so, he might have lost face since he had already promised the Korean side. Therefore, the CPV crossed the Yalu River on 19 October 1950 and entered the land of Korea.

Soviet historian, (Viktor Usov), states as follows: Of course, it was not a simple decision for China to participate in the Korean war. The CPV was definitely weak in the strength of combat equipment, and the Chinese economy had just begun recovering. In the meeting of the Standing Committee of the Presidium of the Political Bureau that continued over one week, there were voices opposed to the participation in the Korean war. Despite this, a decision to participate in the Korean war was adopted. The justification for this was, as China then put it, to humiliate the Americans and demonstrate the might of the socialist camp.

Some historians have recently begun reappraising the Korean conflict. There is proof that Mao Zedong himself changed his position once. Wang Ming, noted activist of the CPC and the international Communist Party, in his recollection, states that when the Chinese information agency reported to Mao Zedong that the U.S. Forces did not intend to invade China when they intervened in the Korean war, he was disturbed and said, "China would have been better off if it had rejected participating in the war. This would have been beneficial to the development of China-U.S. relations. As we acted quickly in participating in the war, so we should get out of this war as quickly as possible."

China paid a dear price participating in the Korean war. The Korean war adversely affected China's economic development. In particular, China lost over one million people. Many Soviet airmen, who fought with the CPV during the Korean war, were killed in action. We should learn a lesson from this. There is a saying in China that it is better to save the life of one person than to build a seven-story pagoda.

Near East & South Asia

Officials Visit Saudi Arabia on Gulf Crisis

Katushev-Led Delegation Arrives

LD2310213790 Moscow TASS in English 2109 GMT 23 Oct 90

[Text] Cairo October 23 TASS—Soviet Minister of Foreign Economic Relations Konstantin Katushev arrived in Saudi Arabia on an official visit this evening. MENA news agency reports.

He will conduct talks with senior executives of the Saudi Ministry of Commerce on the development of relations between the two countries.

At Riyadh Airport Katushev was met by Saudi minister of commerce Sulayman al-Sulayyim.

Primakov Departs for Riyadh

LD2410100990 London KUNA in Arabic 0937 GMT 24 Oct 90

[Excerpt] Moscow, 24 Oct—KUNA has learned that the special envoy of the Soviet president, Yevgeniy Primakov, left for Riyadh today on a tour that will also include Cairo and Damascus.

Informed sources have told KUNA that Primakov's visit to the region falls within the framework of completing the efforts being exerted by the USSR to achieve a peaceful solution, based on United Nations Security Council resolutions, for the Gulf crisis. [passage omitted]

Continued Aid, Support to Afghanistan Questioned

TA2310203390 Moscow in Dari to Afghanistan 1500 GMT 23 Oct 90

[Commentary by Oleg Shedrov from "The World Today" program]

[Text] Dear Listeners: The Supreme Soviet has approved a resolution on the present stage of international life and the work of the Soviet Foreign Ministry in maintaining the country's interests and security. The decision to hold meetings by Supreme Soviet committees about the status of Soviet-Afghan relations and the efforts toward resolving the problems around Afghanistan is included in one of the five clauses of this resolution. Our commentator, Oleg Shedrov, writes on this:

If we consider that the solution of the Afghan problem is the only specific foreign policy problem mentioned in this resolution, we can reach the conclusion that great importance is attached to this problem in Soviet society.

The pullout of Soviet forces from Afghanistan at the end of 1367 [21 March 1988 to 20 March 1989] ended direct Soviet participation in the Afghan conflict. But until now, Moscow has been the principal supporter of Najibullah's government in Kabul. It has provided and

continues to provide large-scale aid to this government, including military aid. This aid, as well as Moscow's continuous and unconditional political support for Kabul's present regime, has recently been the subject of heated discussions in the country. The Soviet Union's troubled economic situation induces us to think as to what extent this country is able to provide aid to another. A serious warning about Kabul's refusal to pay money to Moscow's allies is being heard often. Thus, they are placing Afghanistan in the same league as Cuba, Vietnam, Ethiopia, and some other countries.

At the same time, the issue of Afghanistan has its special phenomena. Above all, the problem of the fate of Soviet soldiers who were captured in Afghanistan, as well as their repatriation, has been linked to a halt in military aid to Kabul and the recognition of the Afghan opposition as a political force equal to that of Afghanistan itself. Given the present circumstances, diplomatic efforts by the Soviet Government and the country's public organizations to circumvent these conditions and achieve the release of the POW's have so far failed to bring about any considerable results. Therefore, the tendencies are growing in the Soviet Union to refrain from any sort of involvement in the conflict and to allow the Afghans themselves to settle their own affairs. For many reasons, the evolution of events in this form is not beneficial to the Soviet leadership. In my opinion, the fact that the final withdrawal from Afghanistan will have a negative effect on the trust which allies in other parts of the world have in Moscow is also very significant. Under the present circumstances, the ideal way out of the current situation for the country's leadership and public circles lies in a peaceful solution of the Afghan conflict as soon as possible. Moscow's foreign policy endeavors, including the current Soviet-U.S. dialogue, pursue this goal. Soviet representatives now often point out that the United Nation's active involvement in this process is desirable and acceptable.

In the favorable political climate currently being established in the world, this course seems to have a future.

Afghan Mujahidin Oppose Outside Influence

91UF0065A Riga SOVETSKAYA MOLODEZH in Russian 18 Sep 90 pp 4-5

[Article by Shamil Zaynutdinov: "Afghanistan: Not All Soviet POW's Want to Return"]

[Text] *A small delegation of activists from the Muslim clergy headed by the chairman of the Spiritual Administration of Muslims of Central Asia and Kazakhstan, USSR people's deputy, Mufti Mukhammad-Yusuf recently visited Pakistan.*

The main purpose of the trip was to conduct negotiations with the Pakistani Government and Mujahed leaders concerning the release of Soviet servicemen. Mufti Mukhammad-Yusuf met with one of the leaders of the largest armed formations of mujahidin, Gulbeddin Khekmatiyar.

"We were somewhat confused when we were met by the modest, unpretentious, and friendly person in his suburban residence. He was not at all like the "leader of the bandit formations waging war against his brothers," said the mufti in a conversation with Soviet journalists. "I suggested cooperation on the question of releasing POW's, to which Khekmatiyar responded that he would be glad to accept our suggestion, but under the condition that the Afghan Government would also take measures to release mujahidin POW's, whose numbers are considerably greater—about 40,000.

Previously the mujahidin had reached the same kind of agreement with the Najibullah government and, in fulfilling it, released two of our compatriots—Andrey Lopukh and Valeriy Prokopchuk. This event was widely publicized in our press. But, in Khekmatiyar's opinion, the Afghan authorities violated the agreement and therefore the mujahidin refused to cooperate further. Moreover, certain Soviet POW's were given to opportunity to meet with their parents. But in spite of the persistent requests on the part of the parents, some of the boys categorically refused to return to the homeland.

As for the rest, noted Khekmatiyar, all of them are living in good conditions under the observation of representatives of the International Red Cross Society and the Red Crescent, and all the conditions adopted by the United Nations for keeping POW's are being observed. In order not to allow a fratricidal war among Muslims in the future, the mujahidin leader emphasized, none of us must allow intervention in the affairs of a sovereign state. "Let the right to choose the power and the system remain with the people"—thus ended the discussion of the meeting with the leader of the armed formation of Mufti Mukhammad-Yusuf.

Pakistani, U.S. Involvement in Afghanistan Viewed

LD2310163890 Moscow TASS in English 1448 GMT 23 Oct 90

[By TASS political observer Yuriy Tyssovskiy]

[Text] Moscow October 23 TASS—Afghan Foreign Minister Abdul Wakil said in a recent letter to the U.N. Security Council chairman that Pakistan "has launched an open intervention" against Afghanistan. He demanded that the United Nations use its influence and potential to end the aggression and prevent a further deterioration of the situation in the region.

Since the Geneva accords on Afghanistan were signed on April 14, 1988, Kabul has been issued [as received] official protests against Islamabad's policies. That Islamabad is bent on shamelessly violating provisions of this major international document has long since been an open secret to every observer of events around Afghanistan.

It would be no exaggeration to say that had it not been for the anti-Afghan stance of the Pakistani military who hand-feed, together with the U.S. Central Intelligence

Agency, rebel groups and their leaders in Peshawar, Afghanistan would have already solved its own problems, no matter how complex.

During my two-and-a half years in Afghanistan, I met dozens of Pakistani spies seized red-handed on Afghan territory, so-called Arab advisers bought wholesale with U.S. petro-dollars and flown into Afghanistan with the connivance of Pakistani authorities.

There is no point in listing Islamabad's deliberate violations of generally acknowledged norms of good-neighbourliness and international law. These violations now rank among state policies, and not only with respect to Afghanistan.

Armed rebel forces are now pushing for more bloodshed, seeking to instigate a total assault against Kabul and other major Afghan centres.

From the military point of view these plans are absolutely senseless. Neither the Peshawar rebel leaders, nor field commanders will be able to score any notable results, especially with the winter drawing close.

They will only increase the number of casualties, primarily among the civilian population. But Islamabad is not concerned about them. It is ready to fight until the last Afghan in order to achieve its dubious political objectives.

The bloody spiral of violence seems interminable.

Still, there is a way out of the crisis. In his recent speech, President Najibullah of Afghanistan set it out with the utmost clarity. It is up to Afghans themselves to settle their protracted conflict, if their unwelcome patrons let them be instead of pushing them towards the abyss of contention and contradictions for their own selfish ends incompatible with the interests of the Afghan people.

The alliance between the selfish Afghan politicians settled in Peshawar and their Pakistani patrons is least of all interested in restoring peace in Afghanistan. This is the vital interest of broad popular masses suffering from the senseless warfare. It is for them to make the eventual decision.

Shipping Line With Egypt Established

LD2010145190 Moscow TASS in English 1438 GMT 20 Oct 90

[By UKRINFORM-TASS correspondent Yuriy Shevchenko]

[Text] Izmail, Odessa Region October 20 TASS—The Soviet Danube shipping line is expanding its relations with foreign partners. The Egyptian motor vessel Rozaltin moored in the port of Reni today. It opened a new shipping line connecting the Soviet Union and Egypt. It will use ships of the Soviet Danube shipping line and the Egyptian Navigation Company.

The new shipping line will account annually for 200,000 tonnes of general cargoes and consumer goods. A group of specialists was created for organising its continuous work. A schedule of the arrival of ships at Izmail, Reni, Alexandria and Port Said was worked out.

A joint company is now being created for transporting cargoes not only from one port to another, but also from a sender to a recipient. With this in view a truck column was organised in Izmail. It can carry Egyptian cargoes to any Ukrainian city.

Saudi Businessmen Establish Contacts in Moscow

PM2210105590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Oct 90 Second Edition p 1

[PRAVDA-TASS report under general heading: "Telephone-Teletype-Telefax"]

[Text] Moscow—Businessmen from Saudi Arabia have arrived in the capital. Representatives of the "SABIC" firm, one of the largest producers of chemicals—ethylene, polyethylene, styrene, and others—have come to Moscow to establish business ties. "The USSR is an enormous potential market for petrochemical products," Mustafa al-Sahn, a SABIC representative, believes. "We see a broad field for collaboration with a partner like the Soviet Union. For instance, our two countries are the world's largest producers of methanol. And we must think about how to derive mutual advantage from this."

Envoy to United Arab Emirates Replaced

PM2110214190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 20 Oct 90 Union Edition p 4

[Unattributed report: "News Item"]

[Text] The USSR president has appointed Konstantin Mikhaylovich Kharchev USSR ambassador plenipotentiary and extraordinary to the United Arab Emirates [UAE].

The USSR president has relieved Feliks Nikolayevich Fedotov of his duties as USSR ambassador plenipotentiary and extraordinary to the UAE in connection with his retirement on pension.

Sub-Saharan Africa

Reports Cite Efforts To End Rwandan Conflict

Call for Cease-Fire Viewed

EA1910172090 Moscow International Service in Somali 1600 GMT 17 Oct 90

[From the "World Events Today" program]

[Text] As fighting continues between the Rwandan Government and Rwandan Patriotic Front rebels, there is a

growing need for diplomatic efforts to defuse the conflict. First of all, it is important to refer to the efforts being made by Belgian Prime Minister Martens, who flew to the Kenyan capital, Nairobi, and held talks with Rwandan President Juvenal Habyarimana and Kenyan President Daniel arap Moi. The leader of the Belgian delegation declared that the Rwandan president was ready to accept a cease-fire and begin negotiations on the refugee situation.

It is worth mentioning that the refugee situation is the root cause of this conflict. The refugee problem started 30 years ago when the Tutsi regime was toppled by the Hutu. The Rwandan refugees have been residing in the neighboring countries. It is therefore essential to look into the root cause of the conflict, for example, by convening a regional conference to be attended by the Governments of Kenya, Zaire, Burundi, Uganda, and Tanzania. At the conference, the Rwandan and Ugandan Governments should come to an agreement on this situation, because the rebels slipped into Rwanda from Uganda.

Until recently the Rwandan Government has turned a deaf ear to calls from neighboring countries to allow the refugees to come home. Now the choice is between fighting the famine or the rebels.

The Rwandan foreign minister last week announced that the Ugandan and Rwandan Governments had started talks on the refugee situation. The rebels therefore have waited for the outcome of those talks. However, the rebels did not wait. The pre-condition put forward by the rebels is totally inflexible. It is that there should only be a cease-fire if President Habyarimana resigns, to which he will not agree.

Belgian Prime Minister Martens is still searching for a diplomatic solution to Rwandese conflict. We wish him success.

Diplomatic Efforts Reported

EA2110210490 Moscow Internatonal Service in Somali 1600 GMT 20 Oct 90

[Text] All international media are reporting on the events in Rwanda. The conflict between the Hutu and Tutsi tribes has existed there since independence. On 1 October rebels led by Fred Rwigyema, former deputy commander of Uganda Army, crossed into the country from Uganda. Fred Rwigyema was born in Rwanda. He said he had attacked to force the dissolution of the Habyarimana government and the return of democracy in the country.

Last week witnessed diplomatic efforts to end the conflict. The president of Rwanda met the Belgian prime minister and the presidents of Kenya and Tanzania, with whom he discussed ways of ending the conflict. President Juvenal Habyarimana and President Yoweri Museveni have already signed an agreement providing for a conference to be held to find a solution to Rwanda's problems. It is to be hoped that the war raging between the Rwandan Government and the rebels will be halted. Another matter agreed on is to bring in foreign troops to monitor the cease-fire. The countries concerned are expected to find a solution to the plight of the Rwandan refugees. All countries which want peace in Rwanda should impartially resolve the crisis before the situation gets out of hand. If a solution is not found in time to any conflict in Africa, a bloodbath inevitably ensues.

Report Notes Delegation's Visit to South Africa

LD2010203390 Moscow in English to Africa 1700 GMT 20 Oct 90

[Text] Reports are coming in from South Africa about a visit there by a Soviet delegation. What sort of a delegation is it? We have invited at our mike a representative of the Soviet Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee, Vladimir Shubin, who says:

[Shubin] First of all, it must be clear to everybody that there is not such a delegation touring South Africa now. According to the pieces of information coming from different international press agencies, there is a group of Soviet citizens, some of them are journalists, some of them are allegedly connected with economic bodies, and some of them even claim to be members of the Communist Party youth organization. As far as journalists are concerned, there is no information boycott of South Africa, there is nothing wrong in journalists going there. As far as representatives of so-called economic organizations are concerned, to the best of my knowledge our main government bodies, in particular the Ministry of Foreign Economic Relations, has nothing to do with these people. In the same way, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has nothing to do with the group of these people. This question was never discussed in the International Department of the party and, as far as we are informed, the group has not got any consultation in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs responsible for the foreign policy of the Soviet Union.

So what in fact unites all these people together? Strange enough it is the hosts; and the host of them, again according to the press reports, is a very notorious organization, so-called International Freedom Foundation. This very organization and some others of that type for a number of years were trying to bring to South Africa different political figures from Europe and other continents to help them in public exercise of protection of regime of apartheid. And now, to our surprise, they invited Soviet citizens from Moscow. But it should be clear again to our friends and everybody in South Africa that this so-called delegation does not represent anybody among themselves.

The question remains: why do South African authorities treat these people as VIP's? Why Foreign Minster Botha received them personally and in his capacity as acting president of the country? Why notorious Minister Adriaan Vlok meet them? I think the answer is clear. The South African regime is in desperate need to show to the

whole world that the sanctions are no more, that the isolation of the racism is no more. And they are trying to attract all kinds of peole to South Africa to discredit the policy of Soviet Union, trying to show to the people of South Africa that they do not have friends in our country and in other countries of the world. We do not think this policy is fruitful. If there is a time to start talks, genuine talks about political settlement, about elimination of apartheid by political means, these talks can be successful only if both sides assess properly the political positions of their counterparts and assess properly and correctly the political positions of those who support the participants of the talks. And in this very case I mean the political support which is given to the ANC and other democratic forces in South Africa by the government, the ruling party, and the people of the Soviet Union.

RSA Defense Minister Allows Forces' Inspection

MB2310141290 Moscow in English to Southern Africa 1830 GMT 22 Oct 90

[Commentary by Vladimir Valentinov]

[Text] The South African defense minister, Magnus Malan, has invited the commander-in-chief of the Umkhonto we Sizwe [Spear of The Nation], army of the ANC [African National Congress], Joe Modise, on an inspection tour of the South African [South African] forces.

The proposal, frankly speaking, is unexpected but is quite in order. It is unexpected because until recently Magnus Malan adhered especially to conservative positions, and was against any contacts with the ANC, and also with the leadership of its military wing. The proposal is quite in order because Malan's position goes counter to the development of events in the country, and the President's policy on the democratization of reforms supported by the majority both in the government and in the nation.

After the talks in May, quite close contact had been established between the South African Government and the ANC. Joint efforts to eliminate apartheid, in addition to everything else, also envisaged the integration of the Umkhonto we Sizwe into the South African army. [words indistinct] Mutual inspections will lay the foundations for such integration. This may happen, if only the proposals of Magnus Malan to the ANC are sincere, and not of a political character. It arouses some doubts, otherwise why should the minister of defense put at loggerheads the Umkhonto we Sizwe commander-in-chief, Joe Modise, and Chief of Staff Chris Hani, in a speech at the congress of the People's Party [as heard] in Transvaal.

Nevertheless, [words indistinct] from the fact that Malan is fulfilling the government's role, even if not on his own initiative, or rather, that part which [word inistinct] by the South African President Frederik de Klerk, is acting in the interest of mutual understanding with the opposition forces in the country.

Commentary Urges Peace Talks in Ethiopia

EA1910212090 Moscow International Service in Somali 1600 GMT 18 Oct 90

[Commentary by Aleksandr Mikhaylov from the "World Events Today" Program]

[Text] Former U.S. President Jimmy Carter has made disclosures about an unpublicized meeting held between representatives of the Ethiopian Government and the Eritrean People's Liberation Front [PLF]. The aim of the meeting was to discuss ways of resuming the peace negotiations. Mr. Carter told REUTER he was hopeful that official peace negotiations would soon commence. Aleksandr Mikhaylov comments:

What Mr. Carter said is perfectly believable . He acted as mediator in earlier peace talks in Addis Ababa [as heard] between the Government and the Tigray People's Liberation Front [TPLF]. It will be recalled that Jimmy Carter chaired last year's preparatory peace talks which ended in failure.

The Mengistu government faced difficulties after it rejected the United Nations' participation in a peace settlement in Ethiopia. Since then there have been many changes. The leaders in Addis Ababa have agreed to UN observers attending the peace negotiations. The government has also confirmed the possibility of joint discussions for the creation of a government of national unity in which the TPLF could participate. Most observers and rebels say the government only became flexible after it suffered defeats on the battlefield. In fact, only recently the rebels were able to beat back a government offensive thereby intensifying their grip on most of the region. The turning point of it all was when the EPLF captured the port of Mitsina. Eritrea now needs only a single victory—that is the capture of Asmera, which is in the hands of government forces.

The civil war in Ethiopia is badly damaging the interests of African and Arab countries. It is out of step with the current world situation. The cold war between the two superpowers is waning: and it was this cold war which kept the civil war alive. The USSR and the United States jointly endeavor to bring about a peace settlement in Ethiopia. The military and political situation in Ethiopia constitutes an incentive for the resumption of peace talks. The rebels and the government should come to terms. The sooner a peace agreement is achieved the better all Ethiopians.

East Europe

Officer Remarks on Troop Withdrawal From CSFR

LD2310152990 Moscow International Service in Czech 1800 GMT 22 Oct 90

[Interview with Colonel Vasiliy Danko, representative of the staff of the Central Group of Soviet Military Forces, by Moscow Radio military commentator Colonel Vadim

Solovev; place and date not given—Danko and Solovev comments in Russian with superimposed Czech translation] txt
[Text] [Announcer] The withdrawal of Soviet troops from Czechoslovakia has come to a stage when the amount of work that still needs to be accomplished is exactly the same as that which has already been done.

Basically the withdrawal of troops is proceeding according to plan, or even slightly ahead. But there are also problems, which Moscow Radio military commentator Col Vadim Solovev discussed with Col Vasiliy Danko, representative of the staff of the Central Group of Soviet Military Forces. We would now like to inform you about their discussion.

[Begin recording] [Solovev] To organize the withdrawal of a military contingent consisting of thousands of men is without doubt not an easy task. Everything which is connected with the withdrawal of Soviet units and formations is closely monitored by a special group from the Soviet Defense Ministry. And the withdrawal of the troops from the CSFR is at the same time the main activity of the Military Command of the Soviet Troops in Czechoslovakia.

[Danko] The main task facing those working with the soldiers leaving Czechoslovakia is to explain and assure that every officer, soldier, worker, and clerk as well as members of their families understand that the troops withdrawal is an important political task. To speed up the pace of the withdrawal, an additional railway link through Poland was established on 27 October. Also an operational group has been set up to work in the reloading area of the Cop station near the border. How the time schedule is being fulfilled is controlled by special groups both in the staff of the Central Group of Military Forces and in all the divisions and regiments. At the same time there are commissions working within the Soviet military units whose task is to hand over military townships to the Czechoslovak side.

[Solovev] One of the problems that worries Czechoslovak citizens is the ecological situation in places where the military units are stationed. What measures are being taken by the Soviet command at various levels to put things into order?

[Danko] Detailed instructions have been worked out and put into coordination with the Czechoslovak security bodies which secure the implementation of measures concerning protection of the environment and organization of work aimed at eliminating negative effects on the ecology. The work of the group within the Central Group of Military Forces inspecting the protection of the environment has been coordinated with the work of relevant Czechoslovak bodies. Also very active is a joint Soviet-Czechoslovak commission for ecology that had been set up at the initiative of the Soviet command. In order to measure the degree of the environment contamination and determine possible damage, the Soviet State Committee for Nature allowed taking space photographs of those areas on the Czechoslovak territory where Soviet troops had been and still are deployed. Under the circumstances of unusually strict deadlines for the troops withdrawal a decree has been approved stating that the main effort should be focused on ecological problems and that operations would be carried out in those places where the danger of water contamination has been found.

We have already handed over to the Czechoslovak side a number of territories where our units used to be stationed—Bruntal, Brno, Frenstat, Libava, and others, without any objections on the Czechoslovak side.

[Solovev] Also the issue of the current mutual relations between Soviet soldiers and Czechoslovak citizens is quite important. What could you say on this matter?

[Danko] The withdrawal is proceeding according to plan. We provide our citizens with regular information about this issue and that is the important thing. Most of the friendly contacts between our soldiers and local citizens have remained unspoiled, even if we sometimes have to face prejudice and lack of understanding. I am convinced that this is only a temporary thing and that everything will improve sooner or later. [end recording]

Polish Leader Views 'Unshaken' Soviet Friendship

LD2210131290 Warsaw PAP in English 1142 GMT 22 Oct 90

[Text] Moscow, Oct. 22—Poland's relations with the Soviet Union are based on completely new grounds now and their prospects are favourable, Polish diplomacy chief Krzysztof Skubiszewski said in an interview for the DEMOKRATICHESKAYA ROSSIYA, an organ of democratic forces in Russia. "We want to develop relations with individual republics, especially with those bordering on Poland," he added.

Asked whether he is not afraid of the "return to unshaken friendship, which linked our nations with a chain in the past fifty years," Minister Skubiszewski said that it is impossible now, and that neither Poles nor Russians will return to a friendship dictated by the authorities. Poland is a sovereign state and Russia adopted a declaration of its sovereignty, he added.

Poland Signs Agreement on Food Supplies

PM2310113490 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 19 Oct 90 Union Edition p 3

["Extract" from Ye. Pankratova article in Moscow publication KOMMERSANT carried under the rubric "Press Focus": "We Import Polish Butter"]

[Text] "On 12 October, Yevgeniy Osadchuk, USSR deputy minister for foreign economic relations, and Dariusz Ledworowski, Polish deputy minister of foreign economic cooperation, signed in Moscow an agreement 'On the Supply of Polish Foodstuffs to the USSR in 1990.'

"Under the agreement, Poland is committed to supplying the Soviet Union by the end of the year with 10,000 tonnes of meat, 10,000 tonnes of dried milk, 10,000 tonnes of butter, and 2.8 billion cigarettes for a total sum of more than $100 million. In payment for the Polish exports the USSR is committed to supplying Poland in the first quarter of 1991 with 1.45 million cubic meters of natural gas in excess of the amount stipulated by previous agreements."

Yugoslavian Federal Assembly Threatened by Split

PM2410093190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Oct 90 Union Edition p 3

[Report by IZVESTIYA correspondent Ye. Vostrukhov: "Federal Assembly Threatened by Split"]

[Text] Belgrade—Dramatic events marked the beginning of the fall session of the SFRY Assembly, whose opening has been awaited with impatience and hope in Yugoslavia.

Deputies of the Federal Council spent around four hours discussing and approving the agenda and also the unprecedented question of when and where B. Jovic, president of the SFRY presidency, should be given the floor—just the day before it was announced that he will address deliver a report on the situation in the country to Federal Council deputies on the presidency's behalf at 1700 hours on Wednesday, the first day of the session's work.

B. Jovic arrived at the Federal Assembly building at that time. However, the seemingly endless debates continued hour after hour. The president of the presidency waited patiently for the deputies' debate to end. This was because from the very outset the Croatian deputies presented an ultimatum: That Jovic should not be allowed to speak on the first day of the session, that his report be heard on Friday 19 October at a joint session of the two chambers of parliament (the Federal Council and the Council of the republics and autonomous provinces) after the approval of S. Mesic as the new Croatian member of the SFRY presidency. With the support of the Slovene deputies the Croatian ultimatum was adopted by a majority of votes.

Thus B. Jovic was not allowed to speak at the beginning of the session. But the SFRY presidency, on whose behalf he was to speak, had something to tell Yugoslavia's parliamentarians.

Tribute must be paid to the presidency—in a critical situation it is doing everything possible to protect the Yugoslav Federation, ensure the observance of the multinational state's laws and constitution, and prevent it splitting. The presidency's members recently held talks with their colleagues from all six republics on the burning questions of the country's forthcoming reorganization. Having summarized all the opinions and proposals expressed during the talks, the presidency was hoping to discuss the various versions of the new union of Yugoslav republics at the SFRY Federal Assembly session. It was intended here that the difficult problems of the union should be resolved not by ostentatiously disregarding the existing SFRY Constitution, which is binding throughout its territory, but on the basis of observing its laws and taking into account the interests of all the partners in the federation.

In brief, there seemed to be a good opportunity for a constructive discussion by Federal Assembly deputies of the collective proposals that had been submitted. The presidency decided to give deputies its view on the political situation in the country and the reasons for the aggravation of interethnic and interrepublic relations and ways to resolve them and also on Yugoslavia's state organization on the first day of the new session. But as I have already said, on the "initiative" of the Croatian deputies, B. Jovic was not given the floor. Furthermore, on the opening day of the Federal Assembly's work, the activity of the council of the republics and the autonomous provinces was suspended, also on the Croatian deputies' initiative, who left the session. It seems, as some deputies noted, that political games very reminiscent of the situation at the memorable 14th extraordinary League of Congress of Yugoslavia [LCY] congress began at the Federal Assembly, too. As is well known, the frankly separatist position of the Slovene delegation supported by Croatian communists then led to a split in the LCY and, as may now be stated regretfully, to the effective demise of the all-Yugoslav League of Communists. Now the SFRY Assembly faces the threat of a split and unpredictable consequences.

On 19 October, B. Jovic did address the two chambers' deputies. The country's public was already familiar with his report—the text was published by newspapers in Belgrade and broadcast by Belgrade television the day before.

The SFRY presidency regards the situation created in society as extraordinary and fraught even with the threat of civil war. The conflict situation in some regions of Croatia and in the Kosovo autonomous province has now deteriorated sharply. The reasons are the same. The nonobservance of the country's laws and constitution and the disregarding of the decisions of presidency and the federal government by some "federal units."

However, the two chambers of the Federal Assembly decided to postpone the discussion of the presidency's report at its sitting until the beginning of November. The Federal Council instructed the SFRY Government to present a report to deputies before 25 October on the present political situation in the country and also to propose measures to prevent the violation of citizens' rights and freedoms and violations of the SFRY Constitution and the federal laws.

Hungary Seeks Reassessment of 1956 'Intervention'

LD2310175390 Budapest Domestic Service in Hungarian 1700 GMT 23 Oct 90

[Report by Gabor Izbeki from Moscow]

[Excerpts] Officially, the Soviet leadership has not yet reassessed the character of the 1956 military intervention in Hungary, and this was reflected in those who took part in the embassy reception [in Moscow]. [passage omitted]

Among the military, only the official in charge of the Hungarian desk at the Department of Foreign Affairs was present at the event. According to Ambassador Sandor Gyorke, under the present circumstances, this can be regarded as an acceptable level. It is not yet known when the Soviet parliament will place on its agenda the request of the Hungarian legislature for a reassessment of the 1956 military intervention. In Moscow, the general view is that at that time, in 1956, one dictatorship assisted another dictatorship, one leadership intervened to rescue another leadership.

Following the changes in the Soviet Union, unequivocal condemnation of the military intervention can be expected, as happened in connection with the 1968 events in Czechoslovakia.

West Europe

Reports Note Gorbachev Plan To Visit Spain

PRAVDA Notes 26-28 Oct Visit

LD2010153390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Oct 90 Second Edition p 1

[Unattributed report: "On M.S. Gorbachev's Visit to Spain"]

[Text] USSR President M.S. Gorbachev will pay an official visit to Spain at the invitation of Spain's King Juan Carlos I 26 through 28 October 1990.

Spanish Premier Cited

PM2210142690 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 20 Oct 90 Union Edition p 1

[Unattributed report under the rubric "TASS, REUTER, UPI, AFP Report": "On the Basis of Cooperation"]

[Text] Spanish Prime Minister Felipe Gonzalez expressed his confidence that USSR President M.S. Gorbachev's forthcoming visit to Spain will mark a new stage in the development of relations of cooperation between the two countries.

The visit of USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev, Felipe Gonzalez announced to a TASS correspondent, will enable us to continue the discussion we began four years ago, but this time on a considerably wider basis and on the platform of cooperation. We expect from the Soviet leader's visit the establishment of closer relations between our countries not only in the economic but also in the political sphere, moreover in the political sphere in the most profound sense of the word.

'Widespread Interest' Noted

LD2310110290 Moscow TASS in English 1025 GMT 23 Oct 90

[By TASS special correspondents Robert Serebrennikov, Vitaliy Chukseyev, and Vladimir Shekhovtsov]

[Text] Madrid October 23 TASS—President Mikhail Gorbachev's forthcoming visit to Spain is arousing widespread interest here.

"I am sure the reception of the Soviet president will be warm and hospitable," head of the Madrid autonomous government Joaquin Leguina told TASS. "The visit wil let us know each other better and use the vast potential for cooperation in all spheres."

Foreign Minister Francisco Fernandez-Ordonez writes in the DIARIO 16 newspaper about Gorbachev's personal contribution in the development of processes in the Soviet Union and East European countries, leading to ensuring human rights, political freedoms and market relations.

It is also necessary to note the president's efforts to create the climate of detente and peace in the world. The words "perestroyka and glasnost [no closing quotation marks, as received] have been included in political vocabularies everywhere in the world, he said.

Great events, such as German unification, a new European architecture, doing away with blocs and ideological opposition, a crisis of military alliances, understanding between the Soviet Union and the United States, and the Soviet Union's constructive role at the U.N. Security Council, would hardly be possible without President Gorbachev's political realism, Ordonez said.

The Spanish Government awaits President Gorbachev's visit with great satisfaction and hope, education and science minister Javier Solana Madariaga told TASS. He believes relations between the two countries are developing well, but there still are untapped reserves.

Spanish Communist Party Leader Julio Anguita Gonzalez said he hoped President Gorbachev's visit would boost the development of understanding between the Spanish and Soviet peoples. "We fully support perestroyka," he said.

Economic Reports Readied

LD2310220490 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 23 Oct 90

[Report by correspondent V. Gorkayev in Madrid; from the "Vremya" newscast—recorded]

[Text] [Gorkayev] What specific advantage can we gain from cooperation with Spain, which is not the richest country, although it has achieved considerable success in recent years in developing its economy? The USSR trade representative in Spain, (Petr Yakovlevich Koshelev) talks about the agreements in the economic sphere being prepared for discussion during the visit.

[(Koshelev)] During Mikhail Sergeyevich's visit there will be discussion on a number of major commercial and economic problems. In particular, the issue has been raised about large-scale purchase of consumer goods in Spain. You know that Spain possesses quite considerable possibilities in the fields of footwear, consumer goods, and food products. The volume of these purchases could be on the order of $2-3 billion. The second very major issue which has already been decided in advance—and clearly, a fundamental accord will be reached on how it is to be formalized—is the receipt of a Spanish long-term investment credit to the value of $1 billion, for financing the purchase of Spanish technology and machinery. This will be used for modernizing our already existing, operating enterprises. It will focus on urgent cases in the light and food industries, certain facilities in the agro-industrial sphere, the production of building materials, and the production of certain types of medical equipment.

[Gorkayev] the overall volume of these and other major projects which will be discussed during the visit are evaluated, in all, at $5 billion.

GDR Fighter Transfer to Bundeswehr Causes Worry

PM2310135990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Oct 90 Union Edition p 3

[Report by IZVESTIYA correspondent Z. Lapskiy: "MiG-29 for the Bundeswehr"]

[Text] Berlin—Recently our MiG-29 fighter was a "hero of the day" in the local newspapers and television—surely never anywhere has it been showered with such praise and so many compliments. Its full glory and prowess were shown both on the ground and in the air. It is just that it was strange to see the iron cross of the Bundeswehr on the fuselage of this bird of prey.

Yes, the 24 supersonic all-weather interceptor fighters which until recently belonged to the former GDR Army have now, so to speak, been transferred to the Bundeswehr—one of the many crises accompanying the unification of Germany. These top-secret planes were stationed at the "Preschen" airbase in the woods 25 km east of Cottbus right on the Polish border. The base has been visited by high-ranking military men and politicians from Bonn.

FRG Defense Minister Gerhard Stoltenberg stated that the MiG-29 will be the only aircraft from the former National People's Army that the Bundeswehr will take. All the rest are being scrapped. That means 251 MiG-21's, 65 MiG-23's, and 54 Su-22 bombers. The former GDR Army received the MiG-29 quite recently—in 1988. Local newspapers describe the reaction of the Soviet top brass to the transfer of these state-of-the-art MiG-29s to the Bundeswehr as wary.

Minister Stoltenberg calls the MiG-29 the most modern fighter in Europe. In many respects it is superior to similar machines in the West. Its engine power is particularly noted: The plane can reach an altitude of 1 km 15 seconds after takeoff. Its onboard radar, capable of locating a target in mountainous terrain at a distance of 30 km, has been highly rated. Willi Wimmer, parliamentary state secretary at the FRG Defense Ministry, who is currently touring units of the National People's Army, has acknowledged that until now the MiG-29 has been the West German military's main headache. He also rated most highly this "unusually reliable and accurate machine—the product of the Soviet designers' development work."

Until recently all 24 MiG's were kept in a state of full combat readiness. Presumably they will take to the air again soon, only this time with completely different combat missions.

The Bundeswehr's unexpected acquisition has prompted the question: What will happen now to the plan to equip the FRG Armed Forces with fighters in the Jaeger-90 system, which has aroused so many conflicting emotions and disputes? This system, conceived as a continuation of the Phantoms and Alpha Jets, will cost not the DM6.5 billion initially planned but DM10 billion—that is just the cost of development until 1996. The political and strategic situation in Europe has changed radically recently. The adoption of important disarmament decisions is expected in Vienna—should many billions effectively be thrown away? In short, the whole situation is against the Jaeger-90. However, a final decision has not been made on this system—the FRG Government is hesitating. Meanwhile, politicians from East Germany are doing everything to try to influence it to reject the new and unjustifiably expensive development. This money could be invested far more productively in the development of the new federal laender, which are currently experiencing most acute economic, social, and environmental problems.

German Army Commander's Visit Announced

PM2310160790 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 20 oct 90 First Edition p 5

[Unattributed report: "Upcoming Visit"]

[Text] In accordance with an agreement reached, Lieutenant General H. von Ondarza, inspector of the FRG Army, will pay an official visit to the Soviet Union at the end of October of this year at the invitation of Army General V.I. Varennikov, commander in chief of the Ground Forces and deputy USSR defense minister.

Soviet, German Police To Fight Organized Crime

LD1910173190 Berlin ADN International Service in German 1500 GMT 19 Oct 90

[Text] Moscow (ADN)—German and Soviet policemen will in the future work more closely together in fighting organized and drug crime. Rhineland Palatinate Interior Minister Rudi Geil signed a relevant agreement with the Soviet Interior Ministry during a five- day visit to Moscow. The document envisages mutual consultation and an exchange of senior officers and lecturers as well as of educational material.

Trade Cooperation Session With Britain Viewed

PM2210131990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Oct 90 Second Edition p 4

[Report by PRAVDA correspondent A. Lyutyy: "They Want Clarity"]

[Text] London—The 17th session of the permanent Soviet-British intergovernment commission for scientific and technical and trade and economic cooperation was held in London last week.

In the recent past it was customary to write that the sides expressed profound satisfaction with the state of trade and economic relations, outlined ways to further expand them, and so forth. Actually, the commission's sessions themselves were as dry and stereotyped as these phrases. Officials read out reports to each other and signed protocols containing more good intentions than real plans.

Perestroyka has made changes to this sphere too. The present London session was marked by efficiency and frankness and the discussion was as close as possible to specific fields and projects of cooperation. Directors of enterprises and production associations and specialists from sectorial ministries, the State Committee for Science and Technology, and the defense complex were brought in to work in the delegation on the Soviet side. In other words, truly competent people.

What was discussed? The following picture forms from talks with K.F. Katushev, USSR minister of foreign economic relations and cochairman of the commission, and with Soviet and British experts. Trade and economic ties are developing by no means at all badly. They have acquired good dynamics. Moreover, back last year the trade turnover borderline of 2.5 billion currency rubles set by our two countries' leaders as the target for the present was exceeded. And although trade turnover will decline somewhat this year in connection with the USSR's export difficulties, it will nonetheless not fall below the planned level.

For several years British business' stance with regard to the development of ties with us was characterized by caution and temporizing. Now something is changing. For instance, the British are displaying interest in creating joint ventures. Whereas a year ago there were about 60 of them, now there are 113. It is true that joint enterprises arise mainly in the nonproduction sphere and the British are still only reticently going into our base sectors, in which we have considerable interest. Uncertainty in connection with our lack of investment legislation and other firm guarantees for capital investment is also having an effect.

As for the development in the USSR of a managerial, investment and financial, and banking infrastructure, London is already prepared to render us active assistance. On the basis of a protocol signed this summer programs will be expanded for our production managers to undergo training in Britain and a whole series of exchanges and banks operating here intend to organize familiarization courses for Soviet specialists.

Of course, movement in the field of trade and economic relations would be even more vigorous if it did not come up against difficulties, many of which are also typical of our relations with other Western countries. First, as of now the Soviet side is already indebted to the British to the tune of 40-50 million currency rubles under fulfilled contracts. The reasons for this situation are well known—the situation with regard to currency in the country is now grave. These reasons were treated with understanding in London. People here would not like to draw conclusions hastily and cancel out what has been achieved. But, on the other hand, business is built on trust and the unconditional observance of contracts. At the commission sessions the Soviet side assured the British that opportunities for covering the debts would be sought.

The mention of bureaucratic sluggishness and inflexibility which dampen the ardor of potential partners has become a commonplace in the materials relating to our foreign trade relations. Nor was a discussion of this issue avoided in London. The British cited the following example. In the Ukraine the "Femtek" joint venture for the production of sanitary items or to put it more simply tampons has been created with the aid of a British firm. The Soviet side supplies the cotton and it is processed in the joint venture into a special fiber from which these tampons are produced. Some of the fiber is to go to Britain in payment for previously supplied equipment. And although when the joint venture was created authorization for this export was received and the enterprise charter include a corresponding note on this point, the Ukrainian customs has not allowed the fiber across the border.

There are other examples of bureaucratic callousness and inefficiency. Now to this is added the lack of harmony in mutual relations between the union and republican organs. Here they say frankly that recently they have been trying and are unable to understand who to deal with. And they want to deal not with 15 partners who push each other away and introduce confusion and chaos but with a single solid, responsible, and experienced contracting party with the appropriate economic and financial potential. It will be very difficult for the

republics themselves to go out onto the world market rent by competition, I was told by several businessmen.

And a last point. The reader may note with irony that this is the 17th year the Soviet-British commission has been meeting yet somehow there are no specific fruits of trade on our store shelves. The ice cream cafe on the Staryy Arbat constructed by the Allied Lyons firm is not bad, but is it not rather too little?

I would not start to oversimplify. The British supply us inter alia with first-class equipment for the sewn goods, food, and other industries. But how effectively is it used? And one more question, a more fundamental one: How serious and radical will our steps be in the field of economic reform and will they create the optimum conditions for this equipment to work to the consumer's benefit? People here want clarity.

Gorbachev Receives British Publisher

LD1910175190 Moscow TASS in English 1641 GMT 19 Oct 90

[Text] Moscow October 19 TASS—President Mikhail Gorbachev today received British publisher Robert Maxwell. Some international problems, including those related to the Middle East situation, as well as problems concerning both sides, were discussed.

Chief of the president's staff Valeriy Boldin and KGB head Vladimir Kryuchkov were present.

British Coverage of Primakov's UK Visit

WA2210185090

For British reportage on the visit by USSR Envoy Yevgeniy Primakov to the United Kingdom including reports of his talks with British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher and Foreign Secretary Douglas Hurd, please see the United Kingdom section of the 22 October West Europe DAILY REPORT and subsequent issues.

Luxembourg Prime Minister's Visit Continues

Visits Car Factory

LD2310140490 Moscow TASS in English 1344 GMT 23 Oct 90

[By TASS correspondent Andrey Panov]

[Text] Moscow October 23 TASS—Prime Minister Jacques Santer of Luxembourg, who is currently here on an official visit, today toured the Leninskiy Komsomol car factory.

Santer's tour of this Moscow-based car-making amalgamation is particularly noteworthy within the context of the agreement, signed in the Kremlin on Monday by the Soviet Union and Luxembourg, on an international automobile transportation service.

One of the oldest Soviet automobile-making enterprises, the AZLK—its Russian acronym—is the country's major producer of Moskvich cars. The factory is now being tecnically re-equipped to manufacture a new car model, the Moskvich-2,141.

Santer visited the AZLK museum where Yuriy Borodin, first deputy general director of the car-making amalgamation, told the distinguished guest about the factory's 60-year history and its present situation.

At the museum, the prime minister of Luxembourg familiarised himself with the latest car models and even sat at the wheel of a Moskvich-2,141.

Santer toured the factory's workshops, showing interest in the main production cycles and in the sports and health centre used by AZLK personnel and their families.

During a meeting with AZLK personnel, the head of the Luxembourg Government said that the enterprise has great technical resources and has created fine recreational facilities for workers and specialists.

Meets With Lukyanov

LD2310193890 Moscow TASS in English 1903 GMT 23 Oct 90

[Text] Moscow October 23 TASS—Chairman of the Soviet parliament Anatoliy Lukyanov and visiting Luxembourg Prime Minister Jacques Santer pointed to positive changes in East-West relations during their meeting at the Kremlin today.

The sides noted that these relations have moved from military-political confrontation to growing interaction in creating new structures of European security and various economic and humanitarian cooperation.

The two statesmen noted that parliamentary contacts play an important role in establishing new political thinking in international relations.

They expressed satisfaction with the dynamic development of Soviet-Luxembourg relations, including constructive parliamentary contacts.

Later in the day, Santer visited the Leninist Komsomol Motor Works where he saw workshops and inspected the works' sports centre.

In the afternoon, Santer opened the exposition "modern painting of young Luxembourg artists" at the Krymsky Val Fine Arts Gallery. The exposition was timed to coincide with his visit.

Gives Dinner Speech

PM2310193090 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 Oct 90 Union Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Trust, Collaboration, Cooperation"]

[Text] On the evening of 22 October a dinner was given in honor of the Luxembourg prime minister by the Soviet Government.

We sincerely welcome you, Mr. Santer, your wife, and all the Luxembourg guests, N.I. Ryzhkov said at the dinner.

Eighteen months ago we celebrated the 150th anniversary of Luxembourg's independence, one of the guarantors of which was Russia. And we remember the Luxembourgers' sincere and amicable attitude toward our country. We are grateful to them for this.

The disunity and confrontation that typified interstate relations in Europe until recently are giving way to trust, collaboration, and a desire to build a Europe of cooperation and stability.

We believe that European commonality will be achieved through a joint quest for the optimum model, through political dialogue in order to produce a composite version of all the productive proposals. The upcoming Paris all-European summit will mark an important stage in strengthening the positive trends in European political development. Our experts in Vienna are completing the preparation of a major agreement on the reduction of conventional armaments, which will mean a reduction in the level of saturation of the continent with armaments. We also expect that the forum will be able to enshrine, in the form of a document, a new quality of relationship between Warsaw Pact and North Atlantic alliance states. These goals should be served by a joint declaration in which we would also like to indicate the principles of our collaboration in key areas of European and world politics.

We also value the evident move toward political cooperation with the major European integration structure, the European Communities, in which Luxembourg is traditionally involved. Particularly indicative here is our recent joint statement in connection with the Persian Gulf conflict, which is a vital element of the world community's united condemnation of this aggressive act. There appears to be the possibility of a concerted approach toward the quest for solutions of other international problems as well.

N.I. Ryzhkov expressed confidence that our bilateral relations also have fine prospects. There is a secure basis for collaboration in the international arena. It is the similar approaches to the solution of urgent present-day problems and the mutual commitment to develop comprehensive links. We are satisfied, he said, with the state of political dialogue between the USSR and Luxembourg and the parliamentary links, which are exemplified by the recent visit to the USSR by the president of the Luxembourg parliament with a group of deputies. It seems to us that there exists great potential for deepening and diversifying our dynamic economic cooperation.

The first steps in the sphere of creating joint Soviet-Luxembourg ventures also demonstrate that mutually advantageous solutions can be found here. The production of iron alloys from industrial waste, joint activity in the introduction of new inventions—these are all very promising directions. And one cannot help feeling satisfied with the fact that, as today's talks have shown, both countries' governments are prepared to take practical steps to promote the development of such mutually advantageous initiatives. We are also grateful to the Luxembourg Government and to you personally, Mr. Prime Minister, for expressing a willingness to shoulder some of our burden of training economic cadres capable of operating successfully in the new conditions.

Luxembourg is rightly called one of the capitals of the European Communities, their financial center. This factor will acquire ever increasing weight in terms of our bilateral cooperation in the process of the USSR's gradual, extensive integration with the European and world system of economic links.

Of course, a very great deal now depends on the dynamics of the changes in the political, economic, and spiritual spheres of Soviet society. We are confident that, despite all the difficulties, our country will get through the current difficult period and set its feet firmly on the road of the effective realization of its enormous material and spiritual potential. In pursuing our course toward radical transformations in the context of the socialist choice, we will be responsible in discharging our obligations to the international community and we are grateful to everyone, including Luxembourg, who looks kindly on our policy of renewal and supports it.

N.I. Ryzhkov proposed a toast to the people of Luxembourg, to their prosperity, and to friendly cooperation between the two countries.

Having expressed gratitude for the warm reception, J. Santer, in his reply speech, recalled certain very important stages at which our two countries' paths have crossed.

I would particularly like to mention the fraternity in arms during the struggle against Nazi oppression in the period of the grim ordeals our peoples went through. The cold war and the atmosphere that accompanied it have clouded these historic links over the past four decades.

Your visit to Luxembourg 18 months ago will go down as the date when we found one another again and as the starting point of our relations' transition to a new quality, the guest noted.

Today, he continued, it is my turn to strengthen the momentum you imparted to our relations 18 months ago.

The process of transition to an economy based on market laws is of vital importance. No one, least of all a foreign observer, would want to underestimate the size of this task.

Those who embarked on this unparalleled task with President Gorbachev and with you—and what we are

talking about is certainly a revolutionary step—are convinced that there is no alternative, that there can be no going back to the outdated structures.

Outside its own territory the USSR created the conditions which have enabled the peoples of central Europe to recover their dignity over the past 10 months. This break with the past and the innovative policy that accompanies it confirm our belief that there cannot be genuine peace without freedom. The conferment of the Nobel Peace Prize on President Gorbachev the other day was a recognition of the international community's high opinion of this policy.

The new directions of your international policy, J. Santer went on, are also reflected in the disarmament sphere. Concrete prospects have now emerged for increasingly significant reductions, as a result of which the Armed Forces would have an exclusively defensive structure.

The reforms that are being carried out in the Soviet Union, the guest stressed, offer broad prospects for cooperation in many areas.

J. Santer proposed a toast: "To your great country's future, to its leaders' good health, and to our common destiny in a new, reconciled Europe."

The dinner took place in a friendly atmosphere.

Attends Art Exhibition 23 Oct

LD2310191390 Moscow TASS in English 1710 GMT 23 Oct 90

[By TASS correspondents Galina Vinitskaya and Leonid Timofeyev]

[Text] Moscow October 23 TASS—The exhibition of young Luxemburg artists that opened here today, seeks "to establish a dialogue between the new wave of art in Luxemburg and burgeoning artistic life in the USSR," according to Luxemburg Prime Minister and Minister of Culture Jacques Santer.

Santer, who is paying an official visit to the Soviet Union, today attended the inauguration of the exhibition at the central house of artists.

The show features a hundred works by 33 Luxemburg painters and sculptors from the artistic circle of the Luxemburg association, which was formed in 1893.

"On display at the exhibition are works by young artists—the future belongs to them. The show signals the first stage in a programme of cultural and scientific cooperation between the two countries, which was signed in Moscow on Monday," Santer said.

Santer emphasised that art will serve as a binding link in building a common European home, which the Soviet Union is helping to create.

USSR Artists' Union Secretary Andrey Surovtsev appreciated the work by young Luxemburg artists and said that residents of the Grand Dutchy would, in turn, see works by young Soviet artists and sculptors in 1991. An exhibition, "From the Revolution to Perestroyka" was a great success in Luxemburg in spring.

Petrovskiy, Luxembourg Official Hold Talks

LD2310212290 Moscow TASS in English 2052 GMT 23 Oct 90

[Text] Moscow October 23 TASS—Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Vladimir Petrovskiy today received Jean-Jacques Kasel, director of the Political Department of the Luxembourg Foreign Ministry, who is accompanying Luxembourg Prime Minister Jacques Santer during his Soviet visit.

During the meeting, the sides examined pressing international issues, focusing on the role of the United Nations in forming a new post-confrontational world order.

They also discussed the CSCE process and the Soviet Union's relations with the European Community.

Deputy Foreign Minister Receives Luxembourg Envoy

PM2310135190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 21 Oct 90 Union Edition p 4

[TASS report under the general heading: "Official Reports"]

[Text] B.N. Chaplin, USSR deputy foreign minister, received H. Wuert, Luxembourg ambassador to the USSR, 19 October. The discussion covered certain practical issues relating to the further development of Soviet-Luxembourg ties.

Consular Officials Attend Luxembourg Conference

LD2310160790 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0820 GMT 23 Oct 90

[By TASS correspondent Valeriy Shashkov]

[Summary] Brussels, 23 Oct (TASS)—"The tasks facing Soviet consular services in connection with the forthcoming adoption of a law on entry into and exit from the USSR were discussed at a conference at the end of last week in Luxembourg. Heads of and staff working at USSR consulates in five West European countries—Belgium, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, France, and the FRG—took part in it." V.M. Zelenov, chief of the Consular Directorate at the USSR Foreign Ministry noted that the new law will mean that more Soviet citizens will travel abroad and Soviet consulates will have to be ready for an increased work load. The issue of working with foreign consular and immigration services on a range of measures to prevent people from entering the foreign labor market illegally is being examined.

Latin America & Caribbean

Argentine President Menem Visits Soviet Union

Visit Previewed

LD2210165990 Moscow TASS in English 1619 GMT 22 Oct 90

[By TASS observer Anatoliy Medvedenko]

[Text] Moscow October 22 TASS—President Carlos Saul Menem of Argentina will arrive in the Soviet Union on October 24, four years after his predecessor Raul Alfonsin visited this country.

Also four years ago, Argentine Foreign Minister Dante Caputo visited Moscow, and Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze paid an official visit to Argentina the next year.

This high level of bilateral relations attests to the stable cooperation between the two countries.

The Soviet Union and Argentina established diplomatic relations in (?June 1976); however, Argentina had sent foodstuffs to hunger-stricken areas in Soviet Russia previously.

Cooperation between the two countries has increased over the past few years. It is based on their identical approaches to the solution of topical problems.

Like the Soviet Union, Argentina opposes hostility and confrontation in international relations and favours peaceful means for settling conflicts.

Argentina has more than once made concrete disarmament proposals and supported Soviet initiatives at international organisations.

It plays a key role in the activity of the "Delhi Six", in which it and Mexico represent Latin American interests. As a member of the Contadora Support Group, Argentina promoted the settlement of Central American conflicts.

Economic ties play an important role in strengthening and broadening Soviet-Argentine contacts. Argentina is the Soviet Union's leading partner among developing countries. However, the sides have not exhausted all potentialities for extending bilateral trade and economic cooperation.

Cooperation between the two countries is not reduced to politics, trade and economy. Parliamentary and cultural exchanges make an important contribution to mutual understanding and rapprochement between the two nations.

Soviet-Argentine relations are on the rise. One can express hope that the forthcoming visit by the Argentine president will help strengthen them still more.

Shevardnadze Greets Menem

LD2410095490 Moscow TASS in English 0948 GMT 24 Oct 90

[By TASS diplomatic correspondent Yuriy Rublevskiy]

[Text] Moscow October 24 TASS—President Carlos Saul Menem of Argentina arrived today in the Soviet Union on a working visit.

The two countries' state flags were hoisted at Moscow's Vnukovo airport, where the president was met by Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze.

Trip To Be Cut Short

PY2210205490 Buenos Aires NOTICIAS ARGENTINAS in Spanish 1921 GMT 22 Oct 90

[By special correspondent]

[Text] Warsaw, 22 Oct (NA)—President Carlos Menem has decided to change the schedule for his trip. After cutting short his visit to the historical Soviet city of Leningrad, he will travel to Sicily, where he will visit with the officers and noncommissioned officers of the two Argentine vessels that are being sent to the Persian Gulf.

The meeting will take place at noon on 26 October in Catania, where the two vessels will be docked awaiting orders to sail for the Persian Gulf.

After a stay of approximately three hours in Sicily, Menem will board the presidential plane and head for the Canary Islands, where the delegation will stay for the night.

Menem will depart from the Canary Islands on 27 October at 0900; he will arrive in Buenos Aires approximately 10 hours later.

Deputy Foreign Minister Receives Argentine Envoy

LD2310210190 Moscow TASS in English 2027 GMT 23 Oct 90

[Text] Moscow October 23 TASS—Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Viktor Komplektov today received Argentinian Ambassador Gaston de Prat. During the meeting, the sides summed up the preparatory work for a visit by President Carlos Menem of Argentina to the USSR.

Baklanov, Others Call on Cuban Ambassador

PM1810154190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Oct 90 Second Edition p 5

[Unattributed report under the general heading "Official Reports"]

[Text] USSR People's Deputies O.D. Baklanov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; K.V. Frolov, vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences; and Academician V.F. Utkin, members of a USSR Supreme

Soviet delegation which toured the Island of Freedom in May of this year, visited the Cuban Embassy. During a conversation with the Cuban Ambassador J.R. Balaguer, questions of strengthening friendship and developing cooperation between the two countries were broached.

Fidel Castro's Private Life, Security Viewed

PM1910134290 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 18 Oct 90 p 3

[Report by A. Novikov: "Women, Villas, Guards, and Other Details From Fidel's Personal Life"]

[Text] All details concerning the personal life of Fidel Castro and the whole party-state elite in Cuba are shrouded in an impenetrable veil of secrecy. However, the truth will come out, and in the course of time much that is secret becomes known.

Castro's family consists of four people: three brothers and a sister. Fidel's elder brother Ramon lives in Cuba and runs an experimental cattle breeding farm not far from Havana. Raul Castro, the Cuban "number two," is minister of the Revolutionary Armed Forces. In addition, he is second secretary of the Communist Party of Cuba Central Committee, first deputy chairman of the Council of State, and first deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers. It is scarcely worth mentioning that the top posts in all these structures belong to the "commandante"—commander in chief Fidel Castro. Castro's younger sister lives in the United States, and is the sworn enemy of her revolutionary brother and blames him at every opportunity for "selling the country to the communists".

Fidel's first wife, whom he divorced too long ago to remember, lives in Spain. The commandante has one son from this marriage—also named Fidel—who heads the Cuban nuclear energy department and strikingly resembles his father in his youth. Fidelito himself married a Soviet woman first and then he linked his destiny with a Cuban woman, and now he is either marrying or has already married a woman from an aristocratic Spanish family. Apart from his eldest son, Fidel Castro also has an illegitimate daughter, Alina Fernandez Revuelta, who must be around 34 now.

The commander in chief's present wife (incidentally, the fact that Fidel is married is kept strictly secret) works in the Cuban Institute of Oceanography and they have five sons, all of whom have first names starting with "A": Aloin, Alex, Anatolio, and so on. They studied in the Soviet Union, but incognito. All that time, a married couple lived with them who were state security employees, and who played the part of their parents.

As for Raul Castro, it is believed that he is married to Vilma Espin who is a member of the Cuban Communist Party Politburo and "leads" the women's movement in the country. However this marriage in fact broke down five years ago and now—on Fidel's instructions—only appearances are being maintained. At the moment Raul is "illegally" married to a Bulgarian woman and apart from this, has an illegitimate daughter by a woman who is the director of Cuban television.

Now that we have finished with the chronicle of the personal lives of the Cuban leaders, let us report a few more interesting details. For instance, Fidel has 32 houses (state houses, of course) scattered around the whole country. In Havana he has three houses and two underground bunkers, where "if need be" the commander in chief can hide, together with his retinue of 57 generals.

Fidel's personal guard numbers 9,700 people throughout the country, 2,800 of whom are in the capital. However, when he visits any province, his guard is supplemented by all the internal troop subdivisions and armed forces units deployed in the area. In those cases the security of one single person is ensured by up to 28,000 people simultaneously. Furthermore, if the leader of the Cuban revolution wants to go for a bathe, sail one of his three yachts, or if he is setting off on a underwater expedition, all the naval forces of the given area are put into increased combat readiness and 122 divers from the special subdivisions comb the sea bed inch by inch in search of underwater mines and traps—plaster casts of fish that explode if you fire at them with a harpoon gun.

And another detail. Fidel's personal guard answers to the Ministry of Internal Affairs, and Raul's to the Ministry of Armed Forces. This was done so that if there is a conspiracy, one of the brothers is sure to be saved and can continue to lead the state. If there is a conspiracy in the army, Fidel will be left, and if there is one in the Ministry of Internal Affairs, Raul will be left.

Cuban Scientists To Cooperate in Nuclear Physics

LD2110044290 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1644 GMT 20 Oct 90

[Text] Dubna, 20 Oct (TASS)—A delegation of scientists of the Joint Nuclear Research Institute (JNRI) took off for Havana today. It is composed of physicists and experts in the sphere of the creation of charged particle accelerators. The delegation has been invited by the Executive Secretariat on Nuclear Issues under the Council of Ministers of the Republic of Cuba.

Professor Leonid Onishchenko, deputy director of the Nuclear Problems Laboratory and leader of the delegation, said in conversation with a TASS correspondent that the task of the delegation is to discuss with Cuban colleagues the technical design of the first particle accelerator in Cuba—the Cyclotron U-120k. The accelerator will be created in Dubna with the participation of several organizations from Moscow and Leningrad. It is meant for carrying out fundamental research into the structure of matter, and also for use in the national economy: It will be possible, with its assistance, to obtain the isotopes of a number of elements and to apply them in geology, medicine, biology, and other spheres.

Professor Onishchenko said in conclusion that our delegation is composed of experts in all sectors of accelerator technology. Therefore we will have the opportunity to discuss all aspects of the creation of an accelerator. In its time, our institute delivered a similar accelerator to the Institute of Nuclear Physics of Czechoslovakia. It has been operating successfully for over 10 years now.

Cuba is a member of the JNRI along with the Soviet Union, other countries of eastern Europe, and some countries of Asia. In the JNRI's international collective, 33 discoveries have been made since it has been in existence: these are new particles and phenomena in the micro-world, and the synthesis of new chemical elements. At present, 13 Cuban specialists are working permanently in Dubna along with Soviet scientists and physicists of other countries participating in the institute. A whole number of Cuban physicists and engineers have worked over a long period of time in the laboratories of this world-famous scientific center and, having returned home, are continuing successfully their scientific and pedagogical activity there. Professor Elias Entralgo, who worked as deputy director of JNRI for several years, is among them.

Supreme Soviet

Supreme Soviet Endorses Anti-Profiteering Bill

LD2310134890 Moscow TASS in English 1316 GMT 23 Oct 90

[By TASS parliamentary news analyst Andrey Orlov]

[Text] Moscow October 23 TASS—Following a brief but heated discussion the Soviet parliament endorsed the first reading of a bill to step up action against profiteering.

The bill envisages mainly administrative methods to combat this social ill. Owing to the deplorable shopping situation, this issue has attracted increased attention. Even deputies to bodies other than the parliament gathered in the Kremlin to discuss the issue.

Monday's discussion of the bill vividly showed the real attitude held by members of parliament. The discussion brought to the surface both genuine concern over for the difficult situation in society, envy, pettiness and incompetence.

Who or what is to blame for the fact that the Soviet consumer now has to overpay for practically all goods, including basic necessities, and is prepared to pay double and triple the "official" price for a car?

Is it the profiteer or the scarcity of goods brought on by the system or the increasing inefficiency of state-run trade?

Will the situation improve following the adoption of the bill? Members of Parliament should seek answers to these questions. However, these questions were raised by few. The majority was busy trying "to discourage people from making easy money."

"Profiteers have got too many defenders" was the prevalent idea expressed by those who urge tougher penalties. They did not apparently have the least concern for recent "stringent" legislative acts, such as the law on action to combat unearned incomes or the anti-alcohol campaign.

These legislative acts were the "first pebble" that brought an avalanche of unrestrained consumer demand, an avalanche that swamped our commodity market. These hastily adopted laws resulted, naturally, in an unprecedented up-swing in profiteering and the accumulation of funds by the mafia, while deputies paid lip service to anti-mafia action. Is it true that "history teaches that it teaches nothing"?

It seems that not all deputies understand the causes of disgusting phenomena such as profiteering. Instead, speakers lambasted its consequences, demanding action to ban, toughen, abrogate, and so on.

Significantly, this discussion was held by the same people who two days earlier had almost unanimously voted for the president- suggested plan for the transition to a market.

And the very first test of their "market-oriented thinking" revealed that only few are prepared to recognise profit in commercial operations, including trade, as normal and as an absolutely essential element of the market, the lubricant without which a market mechanism cannot be activated.

There were sober voices, too. One speaker said that by enhancing administrative and criminal responsibility for profiteering, we only increase the price of risk and inflate black-market prices, and in the final analysis, it is the consumer that pays.

It is only possible to combat profiteering "by giving people the freedom of economic activity," the speaker said.

One would like to believe that this point of view will gradually come to prevail not only in parliament but in society as well. Only then will it be possible to take an optimistic view of the future of economic reform.

Supreme Soviet Passes Law on Self-Government

LD2310185290 Moscow TASS in English 1805 GMT 23 Oct 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondents Boris Zverev, Vladimir Izachenkov, and Andrey Orlov]

[Text] Moscow October 23 TASS—The Soviet parliament today discussed three mutually-related bills regulating the operation of transport.

At first, the parliament endorsed the first reading of a bill on railway transport, drawn up by railwaymen concerned about the critical situation in the industry.

Speakers said that the railway network is facing complete collapse. Rolling stock is dilapidated and the lines are in a dreadful state, making the national railways literally a danger zone.

Speakers stressed the need to create a legal basis for developing the railway network.

Some deputies pointed out that the bill was not fully consistent with "market rules" because it envisaged the solution of all problems by administrative measures.

As a result of the discussion, it was decided to finalise the bill, taking into account criticism voiced in parliament, and then resubmit it to parliament.

The parliament passed a law on criminal responsibility for blocking transport communications and other unlawful actions interfering with the normal operation of transport.

Defending the need for the law, Yuriy Golik, chairman of the parliamentary Committee for Law and Order and Anti-Crime Efforts, said that 12 hijackings had been carried out in the Soviet Union this year alone and about 20 over the past two and a half years, equalling the number of hijackings over the previous decade.

After a brief discussion, deputies passed the law.

They also passed amendments to a decree by the parliament's presidium on compulsory state insurance for passengers. The amendments provide for increasing the insurance in case of an injury on air, railway, sea or road transport from 1,000 to 15,000 rubles.

The parliament adopted a legal act amending and supplementing a law on the fundamentals of local self-government, passed at the previous session.

The act makes decisions by superior councils of people's deputies, taken within the range of their competence, binding on inferior councils. The amendment was necessitated by many newly- elected councils' declarations of independence from superior bodies, which has brought about numerous conflicts.

The parliament relieved Ilmars Bisers of his duties as deputy chairman of the Council of Nationalities, one of the parliament's two chambers, due to his appointment as Latvia's first deputy prime minister.

On Wednesday, the chambers will hold another joint session to discuss the specific text for the "guidelines for stabilising the national economy and ensuring its transition to a market system".

Deputies Support 'Gala' To Mark Revolution Day

LD2310145190 Moscow TASS in English 1440 GMT 23 Oct 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondents]

[Text] Moscow October 23 TASS—The Soviet parliament today supported a motion to mark Revolution Day on November 7 with a gala meeting. Earlier, President Mikhail Gorbachev had issued a decree to mark the holiday with a military parade.

The Supreme Soviet legislature's decision was unprecedented. Such meetings have previously been organised by the Moscow City Council.

However, many councillors elected last spring are critical of the Great October Socialist Revolution, the 73th [as received] anniversary of which comes on November 7.

These include Moscow and Leningrad mayors Gavriil Popov and Anatoliy Sobchak, who urged no assemblies, rallies, demonstrations or other observances on that day.

In contrast, the vast majority of parliamentary deputies today favoured the Supreme Soviet Presidium organising a festive meeting in the capital.

Soviet historian Roy Medvedev, regarded as a "dissident" in pre- perestroyka times, declared that the posturing of the two mayors "runs counter to generally recognised democratic principles".

Celebrating the state's birthday, he said, is a tradition and "it is disgraceful to make it a matter of political speculation".

A number of deputies suggested updating the forms of Revolution Day observances and holding popular open-air festivals instead of costly military marchpasts and mammoth demonstrations.

Nikolay Tutov, a leader of the Nascent Social Democratic Movement, drew fire when he remarked that "the October 1917 military coup overthrew a democratic republic to establish a bloody communist dictatorship".

Session Focuses on Railroads, October Celebration

LD2310140990 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1207 GMT 23 Oct 90

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] Discussion of the USSR draft bill on railroad transport continued today. It was put forward for voting twice. The first time it did not obtain the required number of votes to be approved in the first reading, and the second time, when the formula proposed to people's deputies for voting was changed somewhat, that law was approved in the first reading to undergo considerable work in the committees and commissions and in the Council of Ministers of the USSR and to be presented once again for examination, already by article by article.

Another draft bill also was adopted today. That is on criminal liability for blockading transport communications and for illegal action encroaching upon the normal and safe work of transport. This law considerably strengthens liability for a whole series of crimes.

Changes were also introduced into the decree on the compulsory state insurance of air, rail, maritime, and inland-waterway and motor vehicle transport passengers. But the most important thing here is that the sum of material responsibility for damaged caused to a passenger or in the event of his death has been raised considerably. Meanwhile, the insurance contributions, those that are automatically included the price of the ticket, have been left as before. Such documents were adopted today by the Supreme Soviet of the Union.

However, the question of celebrating the October anniversary arose quite unexpectedly. Comrade Lukyanov delivered a report in connection with this and proposed that a draft be adopted to instruct the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR to organize in Moscow a ceremonial sitting to which people's deputies of the country, of Russia, the public of Moscow, and the Moscow Oblast are invited. Naturally, a discussion developed on that question and the majority of deputies supported that propsoal. But it should be said that it was

a question of celebrating the October anniversary in the country as a whole, not just in Moscow, but well, the discussion acquired such a character. On the whole, agreement was reached that the local bodies themselves ought to determine the form for the holiday, that which they find necessary in their specific localities. It was decided to hold a ceremonial sitting in Moscow and to instruct the Supreme Soviet to organize it.

Railroads Said Facing 'Collapse'

LD2310121790 Moscow TASS in English 1207 GMT 23 Oct 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondents Boris Zverev, Vladimir Isachenkov and Andrey Orlov]

[Text] Moscow October 23 TASS—The bill on railway transportation, the first Soviet sectoral regulatory enactment of its kind, was considered today by the Soviet parliament.

The bill was drawn up by railwaymen themselves concerned over the critical situation in the industry.

Speakers in the discussion were virtutally unanimous in their statements that the railway network is facing complete collapse, and the trade of a railwayman held to be prestigious by many a few years ago has recently not only lost all traces of prestige but has in fact become dangerous. Rolling stock is dilapidated and the lines are in a dreadful state, making the national railways literally a hazardous zone.

Speakers stressed the need for a new law providing a legal basis for the development of the railway network and services which are to play a key role in the creation of a market economy.

Nevertheless, many deputies were critical of the bill. They said it was not fully consistent with "market rules" because it envisaged the solution of all problems by administrative measures.

As a result of the discussion, it was decided to finalise the bill, taking into account criticism voiced in parliament. It will then go before the present session for final endorsement.

Supreme Soviet 23 Oct Session Outlined

LD2310205690

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1840 GMT on 23 October carries the 65-minute scheduled "USSR Supreme Soviet Report" program comprising recorded highlights of the 23 October session of the USSR Supreme Soviet in the Kremlin in Moscow.

The studio announcer says that the morning session consisted of discussion on a bill on railroad transport. It was decided to elaborate on the bill at a later time.

At 1843 GMT, the program moves to coverage of the afternoon session, with Lukyanov in the chair. Lukyanov says that the Moscow Soviet has received a large number of messages demanding that celebrations be held to mark the Great October Socialist Revolution. Lukyanov proposes that deputies hold a solemn meeting to mark the occasion. Deputies make comments from the floor in support of and in opposition to the proposal. An unidentified deputy suggests that with the current fuel shortage a military parade is wasteful.

After 20 minutes of discussion Lukyanov's proposal that deputies mark the occasion is put to the vote and passed by a majority. Lukyanov adds that according to the presdiential decree, public processions should be decided at the local level.

After the vote, Lukyanov proposes discussion of a bill on criminal responsibility for blockading transport links and hampering traffic. The bill is officially presented by Deputy Golik who says that soon blockading the railways may become a popular tool for bringing pressure to bear on the government. Deputy Voskoboynikov recalls the recent spate of hijackings and urges support for the bill.

Lukyanov puts the bill to the vote and it is adopted by a majority.

The next bill to be discussed is the mandatory insurance of passengers; the bill is presented by the deputy finance minister. The bill is put to the vote without further discussion and is adopted by a majority vote.

The next bill to be raised is on the foundations for local administration and self-administration, presented by Deputy Pivovarov. After fielding brief questions from the floor, the bill is put to the vote and adopted.

An unidentified deputy from the Rovno Oblast Party Committee rises to make an appeal against the anticommunist hysteria that is sweeping his oblast. He maintains that the local authorities are doing nothing to stop the anticommunist manifestations at a time when there is an impending threat of bloodshed. The text of his appeal is handed to Lukyanov. The deputy adds that a previous submission of his appeal to Gorbachev brought no result.

Lukyanov concludes the discussion by saying that people should not be persecuted for their political beliefs and the appeal should be handed to the Constitution Supervision Committee because human rights are being violated.

At the conclusion of the program, the studio announcer says that Laptev has been elected chairman of the a USSR Supreme Soviet commission.

Comparison of 19 Oct Gorbachev Economic Speech

PM2210140290

Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 20 October 1990 carries in its Second Edition on pages 1 and 2 the Supreme Soviet speech by USSR President Gorbachev on the economic plan. The PRAVDA item, entitled "On

the Basic Guidelines for Stabilizing the National Economy and Switching to a Market Economy, speech by M.S. Gorbachev at USSR Supreme Soviet Session," has been compared with the translation of the Moscow Domestic Russian version published on pages 30-36 of the 22 October edition of the Soviet Union DAILY REPORT under the headline "Gorbachev Presents Economic Plan at 19 Oct Session" revealing the following variations:

Page 30, column one, last paragraph, first sentence, PRAVDA version reads: ...illustration of that. The Russian Soviet.... (deleting "perhaps the most convincing") Same page, column two, third complete paragraph, first sentence, PRAVDA version reads: ...the Basic Guidelines.

Back in September.... (picking up paragraph four, deleting sentence)

Same column, paragraph four, first sentence, PRAVDA version reads: ...a day-to-day basis. First, it is simply unrealistic. And second—this is the main thing—it would be a mistake for people here in Moscow to resolve everything beforehand for the republics, enterprises, labor collectives, and everybody else.

We are well.... (retranslating, picking up paragraph, five first sentence)

Same column, last paragraph, sentence two, PRAVDA version reads: ...Soviets as well. At the recent Federation Council meeting too everyone advocated in unison that the document take the shape of main guidelines rather than a detailed plan.

We need a.... (retranslating, picking up page 31, column one, paragraph one, sentence two)

Page 31, column one, last paragraph, sentence three, PRAVDA version reads: ...is a complex one. We are going.... (picking up sentence four, adding "one," deleting passage)

Column two, paragraph one, sentence nine, PRAVDA version reads: ...acquires ugly forms in panic buying conditions. It is precisely.... (picking up sentence ten, deleting phrase)

Same column, paragraph three, sentence two, PRAVDA version reads: ...squandering the fatherland's rich natural resources, trying.... (adding "rich")

Same column, paragraph four, only sentence, PRAVDA version reads: ...leading the country only into a historical impasse.

About ownership and land. There is an.... (picking up last paragraph, second sentence, adding "only," "and land")

Same column, last paragraph, sentence two, PRAVDA version reads: ...is very important. And the question.... (picking up sentence four, deleting sentence)

Same paragraph, sentence four, PRAVDA version reads: ...extremely acute issue. The general principle that can be agreed upon.... (picking up sentence five, retranslating)

Page 32, column one, first partial paragraph, first complete sentence, PRAVDA version reads: ...we should state that we are.... (deleting "and can confidently forecast the fact")

Same column, first complete paragraph, sentence seven, PRAVDA reads: ...in their interests. And specific paths... (picking up sentence nine, deleting sentence eight)

Same column, second complete paragraph, sentence four, PRAVDA version reads: ...in the countryside. We consider it.... (deleting "backed up by a diversity of forms of ownership")

Same page, column two, last paragraph, sentence three, PRAVDA version reads: ...in the document it has been.... (deleting "that has been presented to you")

Page 33, column one, second complete paragraph, sentence six, PRAVDA version reads: ...of commodity resources from 27 billion rubles [R] in 1988 to R39 billion. And nonetheless the market situation has catastrophically deteriorated. (retranslating)

Same paragraph, sentence nine, PRAVDA version reads: ...in the country. Nor will it.... (picking up sentence eleven, deleting sentence)

Same column, last paragraph, first sentence, PRAVDA version reads: ...for the year 1991. It is precisely.... (substituting "1991" for 1990")

Same page, column two, second complete paragraph, sentence three, PRAVDA version reads: ...set in motion reliable market mechanisms which.... (substituting "reliable" for "monetary and")

Same paragraph last sentence, PRAVDA version reads: ...going through similar critical situations in the economic sphere.

The opponents of.... (picking up third complete paragraph, retranslating)

Page 34, column one, last paragraph, sentence six, PRAVDA version reads: the basic guidelines. The transition to.... (picking up sentence eight, deleting sentence);

Same page, column two, paragraph two, sentence four, PRAVDA version reads: ...present being conducted. However, there is.... (picking up sentence six, deleting sentence);

Same paragraph, last sentence, PRAVDA version reads: ...reforms less painful.

Here at least two questions arise. First comrades, we... (deleting paragraph three, picking up paragraph four, first sentence)

Paragraph four, last sentence, PRAVDA version reads: ...of foreign economic contracts?

This situation, which has taken shape of late, is impeding matters. And we are already incurring major losses.

And the second.... (deleting passages, retranslating, picking up last paragraph, first sentence);

Page 35, column one, first complete paragraph, sentence two PRAVDA version reads: ...would be possible to set up.... (deleting "to think about and then afterwards perhaps")

Same column, paragraph three, sentence four, PRAVDA version reads: ...the local bodies. This will by no means solve any problems, it will merely engender new problems which will sometimes be even more acute.

In place of.... (retranslating, picking up paragraph four, first sentence)

Same column, paragraph four, sentence two, PRAVDA version reads: ...on all levels. And this has.... (deleting "from the rural soviet to the republican organs of power")

Same paragraph, sentence five, PRAVDA version reads: ...interrepublican economic committee.

Significant amendments should.... (deleting passage, picking up paragraph five, first sentence)

Same column, last paragraph, first sentence, PRAVDA version reads: ...at various levels. I think that.... (picking up fourth sentence, deleting passage)

Same paragraph, penultimate sentence, PRAVDA version reads: ...in this area.

Comrade deputies, completing.... (picking up column two, paragraph one, deleting sentence);

Column two, paragraph one, penultimate sentence, PRAVDA version reads: ...to you, too. Both as far.... (deleting passage, picking up paragraph three)

Same column, paragraph four, sentence two, PRAVDA version reads: ...it is experiencing. One cannot fail.... (picking up sentence four, deleting sentence)

Same column, paragraph five, sentence two, PRAVDA version reads: ...the country's fate. We should also act in practice on the basis of this concept. Unfortunately, other, essentially.... (picking up sentence three, adding sentence);

Same paragraph, penultimate sentence, PRAVDA version reads: ...of the people.

What is altogether.... (picking up paragraph six, deleting sentence);

Paragraph six, last sentence, PRAVDA version reads: ...RSFSR Supreme Soviet.

I fear that.... (picking up page 36, column one, paragraph one, first sentence, deleting last paragraph, page 35);

Page 36, column one, paragraph one, PRAVDA version reads: ...consultants and advisers. I think, comrades, that there is no need for me to provide an extensive reply to these assertions. Deputies have all the documents, you have plenty of time to study them and compare them.

You will surely.... (retranslating, picking up paragraph two)

Same column, paragraph two, only sentence, PRAVDA version reads: ...say the least.

The speech goes on to stress that the center.... (picking up paragraph three, first sentence, retranslating)

Same column, paragraph three, penultimate sentence, PRAVDA version reads: ...the acceleration of inflationary processes in the country. Nor is it the only decision of this kind.

You know, I.... (picking up paragraph four, first sentence, retranslating)

Paragraph four, first sentence, PRAVDA version reads: ...for possible difficulties onto the central.... (deleting passage);

Paragraph five, first sentence, PRAVDA version reads: ...I think that it is time to shift the emphasis of its work to practical matters.

Raising the question of creating a coalition to implement reform, Comrade Yeltsin does so in such a language of ultimatums and introduces so much confrontational zeal and diktat that there are doubts about the sincerity of his intentions. Proposing to set up a coalition, Comrade B.N. Yeltsin got so carried away that, it seems.... (retranslating, picking up last paragraph first sentence)

Column two, first partial paragraph, first partial sentence, PRAVDA version reads: ...Russian Supreme Soviet and on the.... (deleting "on all Soviet people")

Same paragraph, last sentence, PRAVDA version reads: ...intelligentsia to cooperate. (PRAVDA version ends, omitting final paragraph)

Political & Social

Gorbachev Discusses Union Treaty With Republics

LD2310164190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1553 GMT 23 Oct 90

[Text] Moscow, 23 Oct (TASS)—President Mikhail Gorbachev met with the leaders of autonomous republics at their request today. A thorough conversation about the role of autonomous formations in the drawing up of a new union treaty and their place in a renewed union took place. Participants spoke in favor of speeding up the

preparation of this historic document, which is to guarantee equal rights and possibilities for national rebirth to all the peoples residing on USSR territory.

Concluding the meeting, Mikhail Gorbachev said that, while developing a new union treaty, it is important to hear all voices and take into account the realities that have taken shape. Our state, the president stressed, was and remains a multinational one. It must renew and democratize itself and guarantee the rights and interests of all the citizens and peoples of our country. We have no right to ignore history or the fact that all the regions of the country are indissolubly connected by political, economic, and human ties. The task is to attain the harmonization of relations among all the subjects of our union, which is undergoing renewal.

Ryzhkov Interviewed on Economy

LD2310141590 Moscow World Service in Russian 1042 GMT 23 Oct 90

[Report on interview with Prime Minister Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov by correspondent Vyacheslav Terekhov; date and place not given; from the "Our Interview" feature of "The Soviet Union Day by Day" program—recorded]

[Text] [Announcer] We continue the program "The Soviet Union Day by Day" under the rubric "Our Interview." We present for your attention a recording of an interview given to our correpsondent Vyacheslav Terekkhov by Nikolay Ryzhkov, head of the Soviet government, after the adoption of the main directions for the transition of the Soviet economy to the market by the USSR Supreme Soviet. Answering a question by the correspondent—how do you appraise the course of discussions in the Supreme Soviet about the main directions for the transition to the market and what will the government's first steps be in carrying out this program—Nikolay Ryzhkov said:

[Ryzhkov] I think that, of course, that the fact that several programs were elaborated before, the governments program and further the program which was under the leadership of academician Shatalin and then Aganbegyan made another, a combined program. [as heard] In general this was taking forever. So this document just synthesized everything. Well, it is a more flexible document. It is a more flexible. It gives the opportunity to the executive bodies and to the union republics, within the boundaries of this concept, to resolve issues. It is necessary now, first of all, to organize the work of the national economy for 1991, the budget. This is the first task. The government sat from morning until late evening. With the participation of all of the union republics we discussed the fundamental issues of how we are to live in 1991. This is the main issue.

I think that we now need to answer, the most important thing is to resolve this issue. And of course, much work on the program still lies ahead both for this year and in the future. I think, my opinion, if you would like to know it, is that it is not a question of 500 days. It is a matter of five years, seven years, perhaps even 10 years will pass in order for market relations to be properly formed. What we are doing is taking very small steps. And in the situation in which we find ourselves where, as it were, (?we have half) the old system, it would be foolhardy to take more radical steps today. And people understand this. I am among them.

I am often told that I occupy a more conservative position. But all governments should always be centrists. I think that, analyzing the left wing and right wing tendencies, I for example trust neither the left nor the right. The right are dreadful conservatives. The left are being reborn—well, I do not know whether you know the Russian language well—into lefties [left extremists—levak]. Above all, in my view, those who should implement these matters are those who occupy the center. They have radical thoughts, or rather radicals but in real life, they may all the same, to some extent sometimes have a conservative approach because all of the time they measure things against real life. This is my position and I am not ashamed to say that I really occupy a central position. A government should occupy such a position. It should not occupy neither one nor the other. An extreme position is not, I think, acceptable for a government.

[Terekhov] Nikolay Ivanovich, is it realistic at all in actual fact [passage indistinct] Russian parliament [word indistinct] to discuss the question of whether it is possible or whether it is not possible to divide the property, budget, the army, all of this? How do you, as prime minister, as an experienced economist, what do you think could, is it possible to carry this out at all?

[Ryzhkov] Well, to begin with, I would like to say straight away that I did not see particularly stormy debate of the "500" program in the Russian parliament. Everyone can understand that such a program—two volumes, that's quite a lot of material, and they adopted it in the course of a day, a couple of days, in the Russian parliament. You know, we criticize the times of stagnation, when we had unanimity and they just put their hands up and down, up and down, and I was reminded, by the way they adopted the "500" program, of the old times. The debate is going on here, it has gone on here, the real debate. So, I would not particularly agree that there was such heated debate. This unanimity is suspicious, it's suspicious, if you ask me. And from the point of view of dividing property, you have to have a very balanced approach to this matter. I can understand that we have very many state enterprises, and gradually they will be (?handed over to) collective ownership, share companies and so on. But as for dividing up the property of the army, or taking away the property of public organizations, for example—at the moment there are cries of: Let's take the property of the Communist Party. Take the property of the Communist Party, and then tomorrow you have to take the property of the trade

unions as well, and then the day after that you have to take the property of the Artists Union, for example, or the Writers Union.

[Terekhov] [passage indistinct]

[Ryzhkov] Well, then, you would have to take it all, take away everyone's property step by step, today we will take the property of the public organizations, and tomorrow, what, are we to start chasing people out of their apartments? Requisition them as well? I don't know, it seems to me that we have to draw conclusions from our history. I cannot understand these (?various) decisions.

[Terekhov] The rights of the republics—this problem is a very damaging one for the foreign economic activity, for example.

[Ryzhkov] We have made a special study of this question of foreign economic activity. I will tell you frankly that I would be very happy to have the responsibility for foreign economic activity of the country taken off my shoulders altogether.

We have calculated that I was 2.5 billion rubles short to carry out my functions as head of the central government. This is for maintaining the armed forces, what they need, the Ministry of Railways, the Foreign Ministry, and that's it. But everything is so integrated today, and the question of what to do (?arises) the whole day, and so what happens is that foreign; currency is earned by one sphere but spent by another. That's how it is, life is like that. Light industry earns no foreign currency at all, as they say, there is not enough in the way of clothing and so on for the domestic market, while the foreign currency for it is earned by the oil industry. Then there is the food industry; as you know, we buy in grain and we do not sell any foodstuffs. In other words, we sell something else and we buy food. So these are the kind of distorations which have arisen, and we have therefore decided, as far as next year is concerned, to centralise everything to the greatest possible extent, to the maximum extent. And what was being talked about today (?about leaving it to the republics, let me suggest): you take light industry for yourselves: buy foodstuffs separately; buy medicines separately. And then I will be satisfied. But then you just have to explain to the people that from now on it is you, not Ryzhkov, but you who will have to take responsibility. If there are no medicines you will be responsible. But then they say: No, we are not ready because some republics have foreign currency while others don't even have enough bread. For this reason I would single out 1990 separately. I believe that later on we shall be able to hand rights to the republics to the maximum degree, so that the republics might [word indistinct] for themselves. This program provides the possibility, but in practical terms in 1991 we shall have do things in a slightly different way.

[Terekhov] And how will the republics take their decisions afterwards: all together or (?in) the government?

[Ryzhkov] We agreed yesterday to setp up a special foreign currency committee. We made the decision yesterday. A foreign currency committee is to be created, comprised of the 15 republican prime ministers, the country's prime minister—me, in, other words, and my deputy Comrade Sitaryan. So that makes a foreign currency committee of 17 members. In a few days from now we shall ask Comrade Gorbachev to sign the appropriate decree. And so the foreign currency committee will have the job of overseeing all foreign currency, what needs to be done to provide more of it, how to distribute it among the republics, in what areas. So that all this might be done by a collegial body. The fact is that I too am fed up, like everyone else, we're all saying: where does all our foreign currency go? I, too, would like to see personal responsibility, as far as possible, removed.

[Terekhov] Can it be said that the past six months are the six months that shook your life?

[Ryzhkov] Yes, I would probably says that of 40 years of my—what is called—working life, this has definitely been the toughest of my life. I have completed 40 years of working activity this year, and it has definitely been the most difficult, the most difficult. Though recalling my life sometimes I realize that I have always found myself in such fixex, starting from the time when I began work at the plant, so that was a great tempering process for me. But it is one thing to be responsible for a country. They are things of a different caliber, on a different scale, much tougher, but never mind.

I think that in these six months I have become well hardened. I am no longer the person I was six months ago. Now I can fight, as well. [laughs]

[Terekhov] Are you satisfied with your performance in the last six months? Perhaps it is difficult to use the word satisfied, but all the same...

[Ryzhkov] I think that the time will come when they will study what we have done today, in the past few years, they will study it. Of course, today the process is a complex one, the situation is difficult, but is it really so easy to switch the whole country, let us say, from one track to another, and make everything OK? I am satisfied that we are laying a very serious foundation. You know, there is such a saying: when the battle is in progress, then the first rank dies, the second rank ends up in the hospital, and the third rank gets the medals.

[Terekhov] And what rank were you in?

[Ryzhkov] The first. [laughs] I am not in favor of confrontation with any republic, including first and foremost Russia. Russia is half our country and so I am in favor of our finding a common language. There is no point in us [word indistinct]. In the final analysis, we live in a single union, and we have common tasks and concerns, and our troubles are shared ones. And so I am in favor of finding a common language. We should not be making statements such as these calls from Comrade Yeltsin. The program had not even come out, as they

say,—I don't know whether he managed to acquaint himself with it very well—and he draws such far-reaching conclusions.

You have to be cautious in these matters, you have to be balanced. We are people in politics, and we cannot (?approach) these matters [word indistinct]. But a common language must be sought. And we have to sit down together and talk. I am saying that we had a whole day's session of the government, with all chairmen of the Councils of Ministers of union republics present. That is, there were 16 of us. We had a discussion, and I have to say that we came to agreement on about 80 percent.

If you take two months ago, I remember we got together then as well, and there was far more disagreement than agreement. Today, there is less and less disagreement remaining. We have to persuade each other, present arguments to show that such and such is the right path, and that we should take it. And so, I think they will understand, sooner or later everyone will understand that we can only live in a united state. We musn't draw these conclusions about (?collapse). You know, in the last few months all they have spoken about is: The center is to blame; We do not need the center; Is this really up to Ryzhkov? Is it really up to the government?

We are a unified state. As for what the center is to be like, let us decide it in the union treaty. If the center is altogether unneccessary, then [words indistinct]. But I think that since there is going to be a unified state, if there is a federative state, then there have to be bodies of government, bodies to coordinate.

Ryzhkov on Cooperation with Trade Unions

LD2410105690 Moscow TASS in English 1029 GMT 24 Oct 90

[By TASS correspondent Yegor Agabekov, Leonid Vorontsov, and Vladimir Yegorov]

[Text] Moscow October 24 TASS—The Soviet Government is ready to cooperate with trade unions in resolving social and economic problems during the transition to market relations, Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov said today.

Addressing the 19th Soviet Trade Union Congress, Ryzhkov focused on partner relations between the government and the mass organisation, uniting over 140 million working people.

Ryzhkov said the country was in an "emergency" situation. He said the national income will be less by 30 billion roubles this year. The government sees the way out of the crisis through the transition to a socially oriented market economy.

Ryzhkov said the it is necessary to guarantee the right for work. The government aims to avoid mass dismissals during the transition to market relations, he said.

Speaking about inflation, the prime minister said it is possible to curb it only by pursuing a firm finance, credit and money policy. Ryzhkov favoured maximum "caution" in implementing a retail price reform.

Ryzhkov supported the idea to such a general agreement between the government and the trade union central body, envisaging joint activities to realize social programmes.

The prime minister favoured strong and constructively working trade unions, noting that "trade unions are interested in a strong union government, having real opportunities to fulfil the obligations taken."

Union Leader on Unions' Present, Future Role

LD2310140190 Moscow TASS in English 1324 GMT 23 Oct 90

[Text] Moscow October 23 TASS—The 19th congress of Soviet trade unions opened in the Kremlin today with delegates expected to debate ways to revamp the ailing Soviet trade union movement.

Addressing the forum, Vladimir Shcherbakov, deputy chairman of the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions (AUCCTU), said that in the past totalitarian state the trade unions were part and parcel of the administrative-command system which "effectively prevented trade unions from performing protection functions".

However, the perestroika period was also "a time of lost opportunities as they (the trade unions) increasingly lagged behind deep-going changes, acute and complex processes of real life, which inevitably prompted a crisis of trust in its structures".

Having stressed the need to review the role and place of trade unions in society, Shcherbakov suggested setting up a new trade union centre—the General Confederation of Soviet Trade Unions—which would unite them across the country and be a voluntary union of sovereign member organisations, guided by their charters and programmes.

According to Shcherbakov, the new centre should not claim a monopoly on organising the country's trade union movement. He called on deputies to forge constructive dialogue with other union associations that have appeared in recent times.

On the property of the Central Council of Trade Unions, which has been claimed by many of late, Shcherbakov rejected all claims as an attempt to divide it on a regional and sectoral basis and called for settling property issues through a conciliation commission, specially set up on a federative basis.

The worsening economic crisis and the rapid decline in living standards prompt trade unions to take urgent measures to protect the interests of the population, he said.

Shcherbakov pointed out that the number of those with subsistence-level incomes was increasing and amounts to 70-30 million people, or a quarter of the population.

The new trade union, he continued, will press for the passage of a package of bills guaranteeing employment to the population, a worthy standard of living to low-income groups—the disabled, pensioners, families with many children—and full compensation for price rises to all categories of working people.

Pointing to the danger of turning the Soviet Union into a supplier of cheap labour for the West during the transition period, Shcherbakov urged a dialogue with foreign trade union bodies on employment problems, labour costs, and social insurance.

Speaking about the future of the World Trade Union Federation, he stressed that the new-look federation should avoid excessive politicisation of inter-union relations.

Reductions at Nuclear Stations Called Coincidence

PM2310161590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 Oct 90 Union Edition p 6

[Unattributed report: "What Happened at the Nuclear Power Stations?]

[Text] There was a rare coincidence in the work of three nuclear power stations situated in different cities at the beginning of the week. On 22 October planned capacity was reduced at the nuclear power stations in Zaporozhye and Chernobyl and at the Ignalinskaya Nuclear Power station. But the idea that there had been some kind of emnergency was not confirmed when our correspondent called the USSR Ministry of Nuclear Power Generation and the Nuclear Industry.

Boris Antonov, chief of the USSR Ministry of Nuclear Power Generation and the Nuclear Industry Main Administration for the Operation of Nuclear Power Stations, made the following comment:

"A planned reduction in capacity did in fact take place. At the Zaporozhye Nuclear Power Station No. 2 unit, because of a defect in the turbine regulation system; At the Ignalinskaya Nuclear Power Station No. 1 unit, on a signal from the shield control system [po signalu raboty sistemy upravleniya zashchity]; At the Chernobyl Nuclear Power Station No. 4 turbine, for technological reasons.

In no case was there any breach of the limits or conditions of safe operation. The radiation situation is unaffected.

Kaganovich Denies Interview With Italian Paper

LD2310145890 Moscow World Service in Russian 1030 GMT 23 Oct 90

[INTERFAX report from the "Soviet Chronicle" segment of the "Soviet Union Day by Day" program]

[Text] Lazar Kaganovich, the thriving and now the last comrade-in-arms of Stalin, has stated that he did not give an interview to the Italian newspaper REPUBBLICA. The appearance of this interview has caused a sensation in the West and in the USSR. For many decades Kaganovich maintained a stubborn silence. The Moscow weekly ARGUMENTY I FAKTY explained that the Italian journalist succeeded in holding a conversation with him and in secretly recording Kaganovich's answers to his questions. Kaganovich stated that he was a support of perestroyka but he vindicated Stalinist policies.

Political Parties View Union Treaty

91UN0074A Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 12 Oct 90 Morning Edition p 3

[Article by V. Zakharko: "Verbatim Report. Where Is the Way Out, Comrades, Ladies and Gentlemen? There Are as Many Parties as There Are Opinions About the Union Treaty"—introduction and summation enclosed in box]

[Text] [begin box]

A Necessary Prologue

The meeting place—Moscow, Kalinin Avenue 27, the Deputy Club of the USSR Supreme Soviet. Judging by the verbatim report, dissatisfaction was expressed in its very beginning with the fact that not all of the represented parties acquired the right to official registration.

"I personally recognized these parties a long time ago," declared Boris Oleynik, deputy to the chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet, who initiated the meeting and was chairing it.

"Without new parties," continued B. Oleynik, "and without new social movements, we will not move on toward a Union treaty. I am profoundly grateful to you, comrades, ladies and gentlemen, that you responded to our proposal to exchange opinions about what our Union treaty should be."

After giving approval for the participants to smoke, the chairman appealed to the audience to display to the world a model of efficiency and not to repeat the meetings of some Supreme Soviets and congresses where, in his words, two-thirds of the time is wasted and is spent on a mutual exchange of reports, satisfying a thirst for ambition. However, this appeal did not have an effect on everyone. At times the auditorium was overwhelmed by emotion, and the verbatim report has the frequent notes: "noise," "inaudible."

It is quite natural that some of the speakers, taking advantage of their first occasion within the parliamentary walls, decided to announce their programs and the positions of their parties on a very wide range of questions. But 107 typewritten pages of the verbatim report is more than four IZVESTIYA format newspaper pages, and a major abridgement cannot be avoided. Moreover, we are omitting those parts of the speeches that have no direct relation to the subject of the Union treaty, and we present the statements which, in our opinion, reflect the main sense of opinions that were expressed.

Taking part in the discussions were representatives of the following organizations: Constitutional Democratic Party (People's Freedom Party); Party of Constitutional Democrats; Liberal Democratic Party; Socialist Party; Russian Christian Democratic Movement; Christian Democratic Union of Russia; Information People's Party of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR]; committees of "Civic Action;" Confederation of Anarchists and Syndicalists; Union of Democratic Forces; the societies "Unity for Leninist and Communist Ideals" and the Marxist Platform in the CPSU; and the Confederation of Labor. [end box]

"We must not like each other. If we like each other it will be dangerous. All of our strength lies precisely in the fact that we have different points of view," is how V. Zhirinovskiy of the Liberal Democratic Party began his speech, and he immediately stated his point of view:

"The national question is a very sore subject, and it is not possible to resolve it, especially in our country."

Introducing himself as a specialist on the East and specifically on Central Asia and the Transcaucasus, Zhirinovskiy drew a dismal picture in the event that the southern republics achieve their sovereignty and secede from the USSR:

"An independent Azerbaijan will seize a no less independent Armenia. South Turkmenia, located in Iran, will join North Turkmenia. Afghanistan will seize Tajikistan. Uzbekistan will annihilate Kirghizia. There will be war everywhere, there will be victims everywhere, and there will be refugees everywhere. The very same thing in Moldavia—western Moldavia will go to Romania and a trans-Dnestr republic, the Gagauz, the Bulgars will remain in the Union. The Abkhazians do not want to remain in an independent Georgia, the South Ossetians do not want to, and the Adzharians do not want to—they are Muslims.... In short, not one republic has the optimal conditions, economic or moral, to be an absolutely independent state at the present time. Even if we would agree to this it would end up catastrophically for the peoples of the republics. We forget about the Russians who live in all of the Union republics, of whom there are millions. Returning to Russia they will blow it up it from within. But the dismemberment of Russia has already begun; Tatarstan, Bashkiria, Yakutia, and so forth have already been proclaimed independent....

We must freeze the national question in the country. A Union treaty should have been signed in 1985 when the CPSU was strong; we missed this, not knowing and not understanding the national question. The Bolsheviks have not understood it since October of 1917. Lenin did not understand. Stalin did not understand, and now Yeltsin does not understand.... In conducting any reforms, the most fundamental ones and the most profound ones, three principles must be adhered to: preserve the state within the framework of the currently applicable Constitution; improve the economy by eliminating all restrictions on economic activity; and only after improving the economy, start a gradual resolution of the national question.

Question from the floor:

In what way can you freeze the national question?

V. Zhirinovskiy:

By the introduction of presidential rules. Strong presidential rules and direct presidential governing in the entire territory of the Soviet Union.

Voice from the floor:

Ladies and gentlemen, I wanted at first to set forth several points concerning the motivation for what is now for some reason called a Union treaty. First, it is the fate of the Russian state—now the USSR—to restrain many people from fratricide. Second, the breakup of the State of Russia into new sovereign states will lead to the fact that these young cockerels will begin to fight among themselves. Third, the belligerents will once again look to Russia for help and reconciliation, and we see this right now. Fourth, the question arises as to why repeat the difficult road that has already been traversed? Fifth, the striving for sovereignty is in fact separation from communism and poverty. They are not separating from Russia, they are separating from poverty.

The fate of the State of Russia should be decided by an Assembly of the Land [Zemskiy Sobor] that is elected on a multiparty basis on the one hand, and from lands on the other.

If the matter comes to a Union treaty, then very strict limitations must be deliberately inserted into it. First, Russia is part of the Union; there is no Union without Russia. Second, the Army is only a Union army. A republic withdraws from the Union or joins the Union on the basis of a confederation, and it cannot have its own army. This is ruled out. Otherwise, apocalyptic times will begin and a world conflagration will start to develop here. Third, all existing communications will be maintained. A single currency system will be maintained which, of course, does not exclude a national currency as well, but at least so that the ruble can be counted on everywhere.

A. Shubin (Confederation of Anarchists and Syndicalists):

An attempt has already been made here to freeze the national question, in particular in the Transcaucasus, but the problem got worse as a result of this. The ways for its resolution lie specifically through the independence of the republics, in that they will more quickly and easily come to an agreement on issues. National-territorial formations must themselves determine what rights they will surrender to the center.

P. Semenkov (Socialist Party):

Our program states: The existing world integrational processes suggest that life in the world among people is better for all people. Putting it bluntly, it is better together than apart. But if in order to understand this, a nation has to separate and feel itself free, let it separate. In doing this it is necessary to observe a principal rule: The right of the individual is higher than the rights of the ethnos. It is for this reason that we are humanists and not nationalists.

We are for the possession of national cultural autonomies not only by minorities, but by the majority as well, including the Russian majority. Consequently all people, including the Russian people, must be granted absolutely the same rights, and a Russian national state should be created.

A. Abramovich (Socialist Party):

What is a Union treaty? In my opinion, it is nothing other than the constitution of the state that will be created as a result of the reorganization of the national-state structure of the country. What should it be called? This is not a great question of principle, but it is my personal point of view—the Soviet Confederation. I believe that our society, unfortunately, can in no way be considered socialistic, and moreover, ideological terms should not be in the title in principle. World experience corroborates that a multinational community of people, and in many cases with traditional territories where an ethnos exists like in our country, can be constituted only according to the principle of confederation.

In my opinion, the federative principle of the state structure should be installed in the Russian framework. The subjects of the Russian Federation will be the krays and oblasts, in current terminology. For state designations I would prefer to use the terms adopted in Germany—lands. Each land has its own constitution, which of course should not contradict the Constitution of the Russian Federation, and legislation, parliament, and government. In addition, the national states (republics) that are now a part of Russia, if they choose to, will become sovereign subjects of the Confederation—i.e. they will leave the present RSFSR. As subjects of the Soviet Confederation, they have the right to leave it and to organize an independent state. The absence of foreign borders with states that are not part of the Confederation should not serve as an obstacle to this—there are precedents in world practice. But as subjects of the Russian Federation, they will have to coordinate their actions with each other in accordance with the Russian Constitution. It is hardly likely that some land, for example a Ryazan land—the motherland of my forebears on my mother's side—while remaining in the Confederation will try to isolate itself from the other lands of Russia.

A. Buzgalin (Marxist Platform in the CPSU):

Today, any nation in the USSR is polarized both in a political and in a socioeconomic sense. A desperate political and socioeconomic struggle is going on which will get worse in the future. The question arises: Who will conclude a treaty with whom? What governments? How long will these governments maintain themselves? Will they be governments within half a year? Therefore a resolution of the national question should be perceived through the prism of a political and socioeconomic struggle in the USSR for the near term. A formal treaty between the states under conditions when there are no states and when it is not known what these states will be tomorrow is in many ways fiction. This does not mean that a treaty is not needed. It means that a system of measures is needed that provides versions, various ways of resolving interethnic problems for different political situations, but not a rigid mechanism of affiliations.

It seems to me that it is necessary today on a formal level to commit, if you will, a "preemptive extreme"—the granting of excessively great rights (superfluous from the standpoint of real needs) for the "little people" (although this expression is unscientific), nations, etc. I was in Bashkiria not long ago, and there a traditional question was asked: Do we or do we not have to put all documents in the Bashkir language? I answered, use the Bashkir language for all documentation. What do you mean, we will wear ourselves out, they answer. But try it! If you exhaust yourselves then afterwards you will come to the Russian language yourself; but if Gorbachev, Yeltsin, or Polozkov order you to write in Russian, you will fight against this until you are unconscious. This is why the "preemptive extreme" is very important today. Let the people convince themselves that it is better for them to work together. Will this cost a lot. Yes, but there are situations when you should not spare either time or money. But in our country we are getting exactly the opposite situation: We have an "historical lack of not doing enough." We are always shouting about national sovereignty, but on a practical level we try to do everything the wrong way round.

For us it is not a question of principle as to how many states there will be on the territory of the USSR and whether there will be, as they say, an October Rayon of Moscow or whether Ryazan Oblast will be a sovereign state. There is little that changes in form if people live together realistically, in one united house. The main thing is what this house will be: democratic, socialist, one that respects the rights of the individual, or totalitarian.

M. Globachev (Party of Constitutional Democrats):

There is a need for well-reasoned consultation at all levels, a differentiated approach, a distinction in the

delegation of powers through coordination by the interested parties. We must not proceed from some kind of an overall general principle because it is our common failing that we want to apply one and the same principle to absolutely different conditions, as was done by the Bolsheviks and which present-day new democratic parties frequently try to do.

Ya. Berger ("Civic Action"):

The dissolution of the state, more specifically of its historical forms, is objectively conditioned and is necessary. All states, in particular European states, went through various stages of their formation and development, and there is nothing frightening here. It is significantly more frightening when there is a breakdown in the notion itself, in the concept itself, in the idea of statehood. If statehood disappears as a method of organizing society, society will return to the precivilization phase of our existence.

I would be insincere and rude with respect to our chiefs if I did not say that a great part of the blame for the decline in trust in the state and the breakdown in statehood lies with the power structures of the country, including the Supreme Soviet, and including the chamber of Nationalities. When at meetings of the chamber of Nationalities the sources of conflict between the Meskhetian Turks and the Uzbeks is reduced to a squabble over strawberries, this could not help but cause a collapse of the authority of the state.

I am firmly convinced that the national processes cannot be stopped through force. This never worked for anyone or at anytime. The colonial empires began to disintegrate after World War II. The disintegration of a colonial empire is rapidly taking place in our country today as well. But look at how differently the centers of empire reacted to the very same process. It should be noted, by the way, that we can talk with complete justification about the presence of a center in our country, although it cannot be identified with the Russian people; rather it is that authority that has suppressed all people, including the Russian people. So look at how the centers reacted to the national liberation process. England was able to adapt to this process at the proper time, and the result was the British Commonwealth of Nations which combined many traditions, the English language, and various economic and political ties. However, France tried to hinder the national liberation process through the use of force, and we remember that this led to the Algerian and Vietnam Wars, numerous sacrifices, and the threat of a fascist coup in the center itself. I do not want to develop this idea any further. I just want to say that an attempt to restrain the national processes by force inevitably increases the danger of a new dictatorship.

G. Deryagin (Constitutional Democratic Party) (People's Freedom Party):

With respect to the structure of the state, two approaches are possible in principle—building from above, or building from below. The question is who is the main legal entity in the kind of a conglomeration that our country now constitutes. And if the state is being built from above, as has been the case up until now, then it is clear from this that Union laws are higher than republic laws. And in the logical development of such a scheme, the republic ends up practically without rights.

Building from below. In principle this is a confederation. We talk about the sovereignty of republics. As a matter of fact, we must understand clearly that there is no complete sovereignty and there cannot be. Any treaty between any two subjects is an agreement about mutual restrictions on sovereignty.

Thus there can be no talk, of course, about complete sovereignty. It will not occur even if we completely disunite and fence ourselves in from each other with iron borders. Incidentally, about borders. I want to remind you that all of the borders that exist now in our country are absolutely artificial and that they in fact do not reflect what exists in reality.

We talk about the right of nations to self-determination. But how can we talk about the right of nations with the kind of strip holdings we now live in? We have practically no territory, or literally no patch that is not multinational. Take a geographic map and poke your finger into it. I swear that if your finger falls on land that there will be a minimum of two or three nations that will insist that this is their native land, and that according to all laws—God's and man's—it should belong only to them. Well this approach, which we describe as an historical approach, actually boils down to the fact that the dead are dictating to the living how they should live now. It was said here correctly that the native peoples are the last conquerors.

From the floor:

You are repeating the socialists!

G. Deryagin:

Indeed, I repeat any sensible thoughts and ideas no matter who said them. Therefore I am ready to repeat the socialists also. Why not?

We are talking about the right to sovereignty, about the right to self-determination, all the way to secession. But for God's sake! You see, in addition to rights, there is also expediency.... Economic interests demand unity. Even separated, after creating all of the institutions of authority, we will not be able to break our economic ties. We are tied up tightly. We see the process that is going on in Western Europe. Economic needs dictate the necessity to unite to a greater degree than is dictated by any kind of a conqueror. For all of these countries were continuously warring with each other. Then economics forced them to get over centuries of accumulated animosity, perpetual hostility toward a neighbor, and suspicion. Indeed, will we really prove to be stupider?

T. Khabarov ("Unity for Leninism and Communist Ideals"):

We now have very many slogans with a specific content that are now circulating—these are "Land to the Peasants" and "Factories to the Workers," and apparently one can add to them the slogan of "Territory to the Nationality That Lives on This Territory." This trend is erroneous. It is not necessary to return the land to the peasants and factories to the workers, but figuratively speaking it is necessary to return the state to the citizen and the state to a society (any) that is not guided by egotistic but by reasonable and moral aims and interests, including to return it to the national community that is also guided precisely by reasonable and moral convictions, but not by group egoism.

D. Yefimov (Constitutional Democratic Party (Party of National Freedom):

The social mechanism, as well as the economic mechanism, differs from the physical mechanism in that it cannot be replaced in part—it can be replaced only as a whole. It is necessary to have a center that the people trust. This could be a parliament that is elected according to democratic law that is oriented on a multiparty system. This can be a coalition government of popular trust that energetically conducts a decentralization of the state with the involvement of all citizens of the Union in it. Such an approach could in the future remove territorial and national problems that are developing in the country today. [Begin box] Necessary Epilogue

As we see, opinions were polarized. But no matter how principled the differences in the views of discussion participants were, hovering over them nevertheless was a spirit of general alarm and concern about the fate of the country and its internal structure. The main thing is that there was both a desire and readiness to continue cooperation and to find a position together that would unite everybody. This led to the fact that the representatives of the various parties and movements worked out a joint concept, calling it a "Draft Confederative Agreement (Union treaty) and the Sequence of Events for the Establishment of a Confederation." Here is just one page, the first, which gives a rather clear idea about the nature of this document:

"The sovereign democratic states that are located on territory previously occupied by the USSR;

ascertain that the ideologization and the supercentralization of authority in the USSR have led to a condition that is close to catastrophe and collapse;

expressing the interests and aspirations of its peoples;

proceeding from the priority of values, rights, and individual freedoms that are common to all mankind;

having in mind the guarantee of the welfare of its people and the development and mutual enrichment of their cultures;

recognizing the advantages of political and economic cooperation;

proceeding from the necessity to maintain international stability under conditions of the threat of ecological, nuclear, and other global catastrophes;

taking into account the political, economic, and other relations that have developed;

have come to an understanding about the following:

Article 1

Participants in this agreement are uniting voluntarily in a confederation, which later in the text of this agreement is conditionally designated "Union"—the specific designation of Union is defined in an additional protocol."

The whole "Draft" takes up 12 pages. It must be assumed that it will be presented to the parliament, that it will be studied carefully, and that it will be discussed together with other proposals on a Union treaty that are being prepared by the Supreme Soviets of the republics and by the union parliament itself.

It remains for us to repeat here what was said by Boris Oleynik at the end of the meeting on 27 Kalinin Avenue: "We will keep the door open for all parties without exception. Without their participation and help, the model of our human society will not hold up." The deputy chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities keeps his word: On 11 October he met with representatives of a number of other political parties and movements. The key subject of discussion was the same—problems of the Union treaty.

Well, if the comrades and the ladies and gentlemen decided to sit next to each other, getting rid among themselves of previously insurmountable ideological barricades, this clearly shows how tired the country has gotten from the exhausting political struggle and hostility. And this inspires the hope and belief that the hour is approaching when we will all realize: Without civil peace and national agreement, we will not survive singly or together.

Well, finally, we cannot but be encouraged by the fact that the initiative to reach an agreement comes from the apex of state authority. [end box]

PRAVDA Claims Crisis Story Inaccurate

PM2310141690 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Oct 90 Second Edition p 1

[Article by V. Sinenko under the "May I Object" rubric: "Dig at PRAVDA"]

[Text] Yet another dig has been made at PRAVDA during the subscription campaign period. On this occasion it came from ARGUMENTY I FAKTY.

Its latest issue carries an article under the highly evocative title "PRAVDA in Crisis Is AVANTI's Opinion!" Our colleagues from ARGUMENTY I FAKTY have reprinted an item from the Italian newspaper which

describes the difficult time PRAVDA is now going through. We share this concern, about which we have repeatedly written in our own newspaper.

However, ARGUMENTY I FAKTY itself has graphically demonstrated—a real textbook example—how elegantly and easily the facts of an article may be distorted by compression and rearrangement.

The article begins with an editorial introduction, which reports, citing a press conference held by O. Shenin, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, that the question of allocating subsidies to the party press is under examination. It is proposed that the subsidies will amount to 250-270 million rubles.

It then switches immediately to PRAVDA. "So that's where the millions of party rubles are going," the innocent reader will think. And wasn't that the intention of our colleagues, who have surprisingly jumbled up centralized subsidies with PRAVDA? As was explained to us at the CPSU Central Committee Ideological Department, the question of subsidies is being tackled, but for loss-making rayon party and soviet publications. This money previously came out of the state purse.

It is said that a minor inaccuracy may breed a major....

PRAVDA 'Crisis' Reflects CPSU Dilemma

PM2310153590 Moscow NEW TIMES in English No 42, 16-22 Oct 90 pp 4-7

[Simon Soloveychik article: "Inside the Potato Plot"]

[Text] By the evening of September 28 of any year past the editor-in-chief of the leading national daily, PRAVDA, would have been sacked with all the ensuing consequences.

Imagine the September 28, 1941, issue of PRAVDA carrying the headline "Save Yourself!". What do you think the editor-in-chief's and the editorial board's lot would have been then?

This year, however, when people are out on a wild spending spree, eagerly spending money on anything available from the state retail trade, when consumers are gripped with fear bordering on panic, the nation's major newspaper with a circulation of many millions appears with a front page headline saying "Be sure to stock up for winter!" (PRAVDA, September 28, 1990). In summer panic was sown by the government when Premier Ryzhkov announced plans for price hikes, in autumn leading periodicals are openly publishing panic-mongering articles. Panic is any ruler's greatest fear, for no one can foretell the consequences of panic spreading in society; our government seems to be fearless. Moreover, it looks as though panic is being used as a weapon.

What's happening? This is an important question to ask. The future will provide an answer and some time later historians of perestroika may note that at the end of September and beginning of October 1990, an undeclared political U-turn occurred in the country, judging by the stance of this country's largest daily, PRAVDA.

Initially, this U-turn was marked by a very strange occurrence: PRAVDA (which means "truth" in Russian) unexpectedly started to write the truth. The newspaper renowned for its year-long efforts to combat "excessive criticism and blackening of Soviet reality", turned into what may be this country's most critical paper. On September 27 it was still loyal to its old ways when it published an article under a mobilizing headline "Brave the Winter Cold!" calling for an oldstyle All-Union Contest for Best readiness for Winter. On the very next day, however, the intonation of PRAVDA's headlines changed: "Will We Have Enough Food This Winter?", (September 28). "We Are In for Freezing Cold (September 29) and at last a front-page headline "Will We Freeze This Winter?" followed by "SOS" printed in enormous characters (October 4).

This is God's truth! It looks as though the oncoming winter will be a difficult time with little food to eat and little fuel to warm our homes. And the Communist Party newspaper is starting a crusade for bread and warm it [as published]. Once again, people and party are a single whole.

One may find it difficult to see that this pretended concern for people's well-being has something else behind it.

The campaign of unexpected truth-loving started with an article by Vladimir Petrunya, an economic analyst for TASS, headed "Who needs Rotting Potatoes? The answer seems obvious: no one, but wait. The potato crop is left in the fields not because it is raining heavily and the fields turned to bogs, not because picking potatoes in autumn is a chronic problem of this country's agriculture, but for entirely different reasons. Potatoes are left to rot on purpose. "Is it irresponsibility, lack of experience or a a position?", the author asked and promptly provided an answer: "I have ample reason to state that this is premeditated design. But why should the new 'democrats' and their cronies now ruling in Moscow need it? After all they will have to answer for it sooner or later." The TASS analyst goes farther and unmasks the sinister plan of the "new democrats": they do not seem to care about responsibility. The artificially created difficulties they artfully exploit today can easily be used as a weapon with which to topple the current government and, later, the President himself." (PRAVDA, September 26.)

Nothing less than that. Potatoes are left to rot in the fields in an attempt to overthrow the President. In the first half of the 19th century Russia saw a wave of "potato uprisings": peasants refused to plant the unfamiliar crop. We have lived to see a "potato plot" the democrats refuse to pic potatoes [sentence as published].

The author goes further, describing the plot in great detail, referring to documents, which have proved to mean nothing.

We have been over this and more than once. In his book, The Great Terror, Robert Conquest says that all failures and woes of the Soviet economy have been traditionally described as subversive activities of the "wreckers." At the 1938 Moscow show trial the accused were found guilty of every misdemeanour that caused the dissatisfaction of the Soviet people. The former minister of finance wanted "to weaken the financial might of the USSR, to make a mess of the economy, and cause discontent with the government's financial policies and taxes." Other defendents were said "to have been involved in sabotage, responsible for shortages of basic commodities"; in other words, to use modern parlance, "they artfully created sinister difficulties." The minutes of the 50-year-old trial could easily have been made a part of the September article in PRAVDA. The only thing to be changed would be the wreckers' names; after all the defendants of 1938 were all shot...

Indeed, a comfortable position. Nothing has to be changed, but the wreckers.

The time we are living in is bad, but not the worst, however. In the past, the plot business would have been exploited to the full, today the PRAVDA fabrications met with a coordinated resistance. The Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation set up a parliamentary commission to look into the material of the article. Parliamentary hearings will be held when the investigation is over.

PRAVDA, however, refused to wait for the commission's findings. And dropped its version itself.

If at first you don't succeed, try and try again.

No! The democrats "and their cronies" are not planning a coup, oh, no. Moreover, they are more than willing to have all the crops gathered, but they cannot. They are weak. They are democrats.

The idea that the democrats are inept administrators was presented by PRAVDA somewhat cautiously. Yevgeniy Sorokin's article entitled "Bread, Tobacco and Sovereignty" (PRAVDA, October 4) begins in the editorial column and ends in the discussion section. If Sorokin's version is supported, it will be passed as the paper's own view. If not, it will be presented as a point for discussion with which the editors need not agree. But, actually, there is nothing to discuss. The author suggests comparing exorbitant prices on vegetables and fruit, the introduction of "visiting cards" without which people cannot buy anything, the rationing system, "commercial" prices on cigarettes going crazy and "empty shelves in the stores" with "the loud election promises of those claiming to be 'true democrats' who pledged to change life for the better once they assumed power and liberated themselves from the rigid control of the centre."

The logic of Yevgeniy Sorokin is simple: under the "rigid control of the centre" the stores were packed with goods. With no such control, the stores are bare. Logically, the centre is the only force capable of feeding and warming up people, while "the new power teams are unprepared for practical work." And, naturally, they are responsible for "the terrible mess this country is in from Moscow to every remote corner, from Northern seas to Southern mountains."

It is hard to understand, however, why Sorokin's wrath is directed against democrats Popov, Stankevich and Sobchak (leaders of the Moscow City Soviet): They are not mayors of "remote corners." Let us ignore incongruities: the article abounds in them. The thing to note is that the author is absolutely right. PRAVDA speaks the truth once again. A terrible mess. And the new team are absolutely unprepared to administer a system which is a terrible mess in itself. This is the truth too.

It is important to understand, however, why the country is in such a mess and what true democrats really are unprepared to do.

This is important because many people across the country sincerely believe that the new people either do not command any power or do not know how to use this power. Hence the endless flow of harsh-sounding decrees on concentration of power, transfer of power, strengthening of power, etc. The problem of quality of power has become more important in this country than the question of whom this power belongs to. Many people do not care who wields the power as long as it is there. People used to living under strong power believe that disorder means absence of it. Having declared that the country is in a terrible mess, the PRAVDA contributor found a handy explanation: The trouble is that "those learned economists fear they may become unpopular and prefer not to speak of discipine and their responsiblity for what they have done." Once again this notorious bunch: democrats and economists... As for the President, he is not afraid of talking about responsiblity. In fact, he is calling for more responsiblity all the time. So what?" ...Even presidential decrees often lose their power when they get to the regions they concern....", the author writes never noticing that this empyric observation destroys his theory of the democrats; administrative impotence.

Speculations are numerous and lengthy, while the main question remains: Why are yesterday's capable authorities suddenly powerless? Why do people not pick the potatoes, do not surrender arms, why do they break economic links and why is crime rampant?

In the past, we used to have the occasional crop failures too. Sugar and tobacco shortages are nothing new either and in olden days shops were not exactly packed to capacity with goods. Still, the authorities had ways to deal with these problems.

The year of 1929 witnessed a situation similar to now: the grain crop was good, but peasants refused to sell grain to the state: they were dissatisfied with the state

wholesale prices. Just as it is today, say, in the Krasnodar Territory where 3.4 million tons of grain had been delivered to the state by October 4, instead of the plan target figure of 4 million tons. Local kolkhozes and sovkhozes [collective and state farms] chose to keep 5.9 million tons of grain. How would the authorities have reacted back in 1929? First, local party bosses would have been accused of sympathizing with the kulaks and undermining Soviet power. Then failure to deliver grain would have been declared a criminal offense. Then a dozen procurators would have been arrested and accused of covering up such offenses. Then the entire grain crop, including the seed fund, would have been confiscated and peasants who had been unfortunate enough to possess any grain would have been deported to Siberia to die. After that excellent order would have been restored in the country and there would have not been any terrible mess from Northern seas across to Southern mountain peaks.

Another good example is the early 1930s. There was not enough grain to meet export commitments. To solve the problem, the authorities confiscated all grain in the Ukraine and other regions, milions were killed by famine, and the country was perfectly in order.

Well, this was long ago. Ok, here is another story from the not so distant past, a peaceful story with not a single death or prison term.

When I was young, I worked as a reporter for a small-circulation newspaper published for the workers employed in the construction of Moscow's mammoth Luzhniki stadium. Dozens of construction trusts from different districts of Moscow were involved in the venture but there was little progress. Yekaterina Furtseva, the then Moscow party boss, used to attend regular working meetings herself. In a tired voice she tongue-lashed the people responsible for the construction and listened to their explanation and excuses. However, nothing helped. In fact, Furtseva was as powerless as today's democrats. When only one year was left before the scheduled completion of the Luzhniki project, the work suddenly intensifed. Constructions was in full swing. Workers were recalled from lots of other Moscow projects and assigned to the Luzhniki site.

Was it a Central Committee decree that worked this miracle? But CC decrees were never in short supply. The reason was different. The party organizations of all construction trusts were brought together under the umbrella of the Frunzensky District Party Committee. As a result, the stadium was commissioned dead on time and hosted the 1956 National Games.

On that fateful day the party committee of the Luzhniki project was given the right to issue reprimands and expulsions from the party. And all the directors of construction trusts were party members and knew all too well what expulsion from the party meant: end of one's career, job loss, virtual unemployment. One man I knew was unfortunate enough to cross his bosses and was expelled from the party. He was unable to get a job as a driver after that: His former high position was mentioned in his work record book and any time he applied for a job, personnel section people started asking questions. Finally, they would phone Moscow to inquire about the man and officials in Moscow would instruct them to decline the application: "He wants to work as a driver? This must be some kind of a provocation."

As they carried party registration cards to the new location, couriers transported the right to life. In 1956 there was no need for shootings or imprisonments: the threat "You will have to turn in your party card!" was enough. Once threatened with expulsion, people became obedient servants of the "higher bodies" and were ready to carry out any orders for party committees, and these orders were all illegal ones. When everything was legal, party committees needed not to interfere, but once a party committee stepped in, this meant that law had to be broken.

That's how things were done in the country. That's how power was exercised. So why do we deceive ourselves now? Why don't we speak about the most important matters?

The "Command-and-administer" system was a social eye-opener in its time. But this formula was not completely correct, that is why administrators from the bottom up are only too pleased to repeat it again and again. The main component of the system is not command, but punishment, a total punishment that can destroy one's whole life, a punishment turning one into a pariah. People are allowed to join the Communist Party otherwise one could not threaten them with expulsion from it. All more or less significant positions in this country are filled by party members not because these people are better, or more talented than others: they can be controlled - and punished without a trial for the slightest disobedience. The power of the party was in the omnipresence of what was called "the party infuence" and there was no place in the vast country where the unfortunate expelee could hide from it. That is why local party bosses hate the cooperatives: one may be expelled from the party, fired from the job and one can still slip away and become a co-op member. Can a jailer be happy about holes in the prison wall?

As man is both a spiritual and physical being, likewise power over man can be both spiritual and physical. For many years the Communist Party and the ideals it declared have been the source of spiritual power for lots of people and this spiritual power made people work conscientiously. In economics, however, where talent and industry are necessary, no one has ever been able to do without some material coercion. Ideas are accepted by the masses when there is a material force behind them. Is it a secret why in the past urban dwellers were paid next to nothing for helping peasant pick potatoes, but yet worked in the fields every autumn, while today even a daily pay of 25 rubles fails to attract them? The reason is simple: in the past one phone call from a party

committee instructor was enough to make a factory manager close the factory and drive all workers into the fields, although the manager knew all too well this was both illegal and stupid.

Are democrats really inept administrators? Fortunately for them, Popov and Sobchak do not have the power the old party-punitive system possessed: the power to threaten, to ruin people's lives, and, if necessary, to imprison people on the basis of fake evidence the local KGB office was asked and ever ready to provide.

And no other power exists in the country now. Is it so hard to understand?

The slogan "All Power to the Soviets!" never fails to amaze me. Soviets, just like municipal bodies of power, can control the activities of officials and establish and levy taxes within their territories. But how can a soviet influence a factory director, a kolkhoz chairman, a private vendor? Will anyone obey the mayor if the latter does not possess the right to decide people's destinies? Is there a punishment that oculd compare to expulsion from the party? The entire system of power in this country is such that without the threat of party reprisals factories do not work, bread is not baked and the country slips into a terrible mess which neither harsh decrees nor sarcastic articles can clear up.

Shall we go back? Shall we return to the command-and-punish system? Shall we all sink to our knees imploring party committees to return to power? Come and rule us?

There is one problem, though. When interviewed by IZVESTIA, deputy minister of power industry and electrification of the USSR Yevgeniy Petryayev said:

"The equipment in most power generating plants is worn and needs to be replaced. And we have no reserve capacities to use during the refitting."

That is how it is everywhere: equipment is worn out, roads are bad, shortages of housing can strangle any power, and there is not enough oil: this is the legacy the party system left us before declaring that party committees would not meddle with economics any longer and concern themselves primarily with ideology. Actually the party has left us a system which cannot work without the right to punish the innocent and the guilty and now it dares to reproach the new people for their ineptitude.

Pleas for a firm hand are often heard.

Could a firm hand help now? Let's be realistic! Let us close down all newspapers, dissolve all parliaments and crack down on dissidence, and use the Chilean scenario. However, in Chile, every owner and producer feared bankruptcy. Is there anything that can scare a Soviet factory manager? No decree or law can scare him, even if sacked he will soon find another job. He cannot be expelled from the party any longer. He will be only too pleased to quit membership voluntarily as Yeltsin did.

In fact there are two ways out: either to restore power to the party and let the party finish off the ailing economy, or to give complete economic freedom to owners, letting them feel the fear of bankruptcy. There is no any [as published] third way, only to wade deeper into the mess. The Communist Party and the existing economic system are Siamese twins which no surgeon can separate, for they have a common heart: the party membership card acting as a driving force.

But who today is the most repulsive of all? The one who giggles, who rubs his hands in glee, points his finger at the democrats: "Look at them! They are to blame? Out with them!" In the past everybody was a democrat, but there was no democracy. Today everyone wants democracy, but no one likes democrats. This is the essence of all the potato plot fabrications.

P.S. Events in this country develop faster than journalists write. It was announced on TV that there was unrest in the Communist Party's shrine, the editorial office of PRAVDA! A party meeting, meaning the meeting of all the newspaper staff, continued to rage for three days at PRAVDA. Now not only readers, but staff writers of PRAVDA are dissatisfied with the paper's content and stance. People are reluctant to subscribe to PRAVDA and staff writers, many of whom are really talented people, do not want to have a part in a bad newspaper any more. PRAVDA, which used to be above suspicion, has become the subject of furious criticism from all sides.

The little information that we have, has it that the communists working for PRAVDA pased the vote of no confidence in the paper's editor-in-chief, Ivan Frolov. The latter declined to bow to criticism and claimed that the critics had been guided by personal antagonism towards him. The assessments of the activities of the editorial board voiced in those three days ranged from "utterly unsatisfactory" to "insufficiently active." Forty people voted for the former resolution and 70 for the later. The party organization of PRAVDA decided to address the CPSU Central Committee plenum scheduled for October 8. By the time this issue was ready for print, no other information was available.

The crisis in PRAVDA reflects the crisis in the Communist Party itself. Until very recently PRAVDA's opinion was never challenged. In the 1930s a critical article in PRAVDA meant several shootings, in the 1970s, several heart attacks. Very often PRAVDA's critical articles were used as ways to deliver the sentence passed on someone at the top. The paper also had almost unlimited opportunity to protect people from arbitrary treatment by local authorities or government agencies. All prominent and innovative teachers in this country, from Sukhomlinsky to Shatalov, enjoyed PRAVDA's support.

Today the material power of PRAVDA is vanishing, just like the material power of the party itself. It can neither pardon nor punish anymore. Today its weight and future depend on whether it will be able to command moral

authority. PRAVDA used to depend on the Communist Party. Today the very existence of the Communist Party may depend on what PRAVDA will become.

Law on Freedom of Conscience, Religion

91UN0058A Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Oct 90 p 4

["Law of the USSR: On Freedom of Conscience and Religious Organizations"]

[Text]

Section I

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Article 1. The purpose of the law

This law guarantees the rights of citizens to decide and express their attitude toward religion, to convictions corresponding to this, and to the unhindered confession of a religion and the exercise of religious rites, and also to equality and protection of the rights and interests of citizens regardless of their attitude toward religion, and regulates the relations pertaining to the activity of religious organizations.

Article 2. Legislation on freedom of conscience and religious organizations

Legislation on freedom of conscience and religious organizations is made up of this law, which establishes the fundamental guarantees of freedom of conscience in accordance with the USSR Constitution, and the laws of the USSR and the Union and autonomous republics published in accordance with it.

Article 3. The right to freedom of conscience

In accordance with the law on freedom of conscience, each citizen independently decides his own attitude toward religion and enjoys the right of confessing any religion either alone or jointly with others, or not to confess any religion, and to express and spread convictions associated with his attitude toward religion.

Parents and persons acting in loco parentis have the right in mutual agreement to rear their own children in accordance with their personal attitudes toward religion.

No compulsion of any kind is permitted when a citizen decides his own attitude toward religion or to the confession or nonconfession of a religion, or to participation or nonparticipation in divine service and religious rites and ceremonies, and in religious instruction.

The exercise of freedom of conscience, religion, or conviction is subject only to the limitations necessary to maintain public safety and order, life and well-being, and morals, and also the rights and freedoms of other citizens as established by law and compatible with the international obligations of the USSR.

Article 4. Equality of citizens regardless of their attitude toward religion

Citizens of the USSR are equal under the law in all fields of civic, political, economic, social, and cultural life regardless of their attitude toward religion. No indication of the attitude of a citizen toward religion is permitted in official documents except in cases where the citizen himself so desires this.

Any direct or indirect limitation on the rights of a citizen or the establishment of any advantages for citizens depending on their attitude toward religion, and equally incitement of enmity or hostility associated with this, or insult against the sentiments of citizens, are subject to criminal liability as established by law.

No one may by reason of his own religious persuasions avoid observance of obligations established by law. Replacement of one obligation with another for reasons of religious persuasion is permitted only in cases as provided for by USSR legislation.

Article 5. Separation of church (religious organizations) and state

All religions and denominations are equal under the law. The establishment of any advantages or restrictions with respect to one religion or denomination over others is not permitted.

The state does not assign to religious organizations the discharge of any state function and it does not intervene in the activity of religious organizations if that activity does not contravene legislation. The state does not fund religious organizations or activity associated with the propaganda of atheism.

No restrictions are permitted on the conducting of scientific research, including research funded by the state, or propaganda of its results or inclusion of those results in any general program of education on the grounds that they are in accordance with or not in accordance with the tenets of any religion or of atheism.

Religious organizations do not carry out state functions.

Religious organizations enjoy the right to participate in public life, and also to make use of the mass media on an equal footing with public associations.

Religious organizations do not participate in the activity of political parties and do not provide financial assistance for political parties. Ministers of religious organizations have the right to participate in political life on an equal footing with all citizens.

Religious organizations are obliged to observe the requirements of existing legislation and law and order.

The state promotes the establishment of relations of mutual tolerance and respect between citizens who confess a religion and citizens who do not, and between religious organizations, and also between their followers.

Article 6. Separation of school and state (religious organizations)

The state system of education in the USSR is separate from the church and is secular in nature. Access to the various kinds and levels of education is granted to citizens regardless of their attitude toward religion.

Citizens may be instructed in a religious doctrine and obtain a religious education in the language of their choice either individually or jointly with others.

Religious organizations that have charters (or statutes) registered in accordance with the established procedure have the right in accordance with their own enactments to set up educational establishments and groups for the religious education of children and adults, and also to engage in teaching in other forms, making use of premises that they own or that are made available for their use for this.

Section II

RELIGIOUS ORGANIZATIONS IN THE USSR

Article 7. Religious Organizations

Religious organizations in the USSR are religious societies, boards, and centers, monasteries, religious brotherhoods, missionary societies (missions), and spiritual training institutions, and also associations made up of religious organizations. Religious associations in the USSR are formed for the purpose of satisfying the religious needs of citizens with respect to professing and spreading a faith, and they operate in accordance with their own structure and select, appoint, and change their own personnel in accordance with their own charters (or statutes).

Article 8. The religious society

A religious society is formed by citizens for the purpose of jointly professing a faith and satisfying other religious needs, and operates on a voluntary basis.

It is not mandatory to inform the state organs that a religious society has been set up.

Article 9. Religious boards, centers, and associations

Religious boards, centers, and associations operate on the basis of their own charters (or statutes) insofar as they do not contravene existing legislation.

Religious organizations in the USSR that have leading centers abroad may be guided in their activity by their own charters (or statutes) if when this occurs it does not violate Soviet legislation.

Relations between the state and religious boards, centers, and associations, including those abroad, are not regulated by law and are determined in accordance with agreement between them and state organs.

Article 10. Monasteries, brotherhoods, and missions

Religious boards and centers may in accordance with their own registered charters (or statutes) establish monasteries, religious brotherhoods, and missionary organizations (missions), which operate on the basis of their own charters (or statutes) registered in accordance with the procedure established by law.

Monasteries and religious brotherhoods may also be formed in accordance with the procedure laid down by this law in order to form religious societies whose charters (or statutes) are registered.

Article 11. Spiritual training establishments

Religious boards and centers have the right in accordance with their own registered charters (or statutes) to set up religious training establishments to train clergymen and other ministers needed by them for religious specialties. Spiritual training establishments operate on the basis of their own charter (or statutes) registered in accordance with the procedure established by law.

Citizens engaged in full-time studies at higher and secondary religious training establishments enjoy the same rights and privileges of deferment of military service, taxation, and inclusion of time spent in study as labor seniority as laid down for students at state educational establishments.

Article 12. Charters of religious organizations

The charter (or statutes) of a religious organization must in accordance with civil law defining its legal capacity be registered under the procedure established by law. This charter contains information on the kind and location of the religious organization, its regulation denomination, its place within the organizational structure of a religious association, its position with respect to property, rights to set up enterprises and means of mass information, the foundation of other religious organizations, setting up training establishments and other powers, and the procedure for resolving property and other matters in the event that its activity is terminated, and also other provisions connected with the special features of the activity of that organization.

The charter (or statutes) or other documents defining the regulation training aspects of activity and resolving other internal matters of a religious organization need not be registered with state organs. The state takes into consideration and respects the internal enactments of religious organizations if they are submitted to appropriate state organs and insofar as they do not contravene existing legislation.

Article 13. Religious organizations as legal entities

Religious organizations are recognized as legal entities from the moment of registration of their charters (or statutes).

As legal entities, religious organizations enjoy rights and bear obligations in accordance with legislation and their own charter (or statutes).

Article 14. Registration of the charters of religious organizations

In order for a religious organization to obtain legal capacity as a legal entity for citizens who have attained the age of 18, at least 10 persons must make an application with the charter (or statutes) to the executive committee of the rayon (or city) soviet of people's deputies at the place of the proposed activity of the society. In the event that a religious society belongs to some religious organization, this is indicated in the charter and confirmed by the appropriate religious board or center. The executive committee considers the statement within one month and makes an appropriate decision.

If the confirmation mentioned in the previous paragraph of this article is not provided, the executive committee of the local soviet of people's deputies has the right to ask for additional materials and to seek the opinion of specialists. In this event the decision is made within a three-month period.

Religious associations, and also centers, boards, monasteries, religious brotherhoods, missions, and spiritual training centers set up by religious organizations submit the charter (or statutes) adopted by these organizations for registration with the executive committee of the rayon (or city) soviet of people's deputies at the place of their location. The executive committee makes a decision on registration within one month.

Different procedures may be established for registration of the charter (or statutes) of religious organizations under the laws of Union and autonomous republics.

Article 15. Refusal to register the charter of a religious organization

A decision to refuse to register the charter (or statutes) of a religious society or religious organization is sent in written form, indicating the reasons for refusal. This decision, or delay beyond the period laid down by this law for reaching decisions, may be appealed in the courts according to the procedure laid down for appeals against unlawful actions by the organs of state management and officials who infringe on the rights of citizens.

Article 16. Discontinuance of the activity of a religious organization

The activity of religious organizations may be discontinued only when they are liquidated in accordance with their own enactments or if there is violation of the provisions of this law or other laws of the USSR or the Union and autonomous republics.

A decision to discontinue the activity of a religious organization is made by the organ that registered its charter (or statutes). This decision may be appealed in the courts according to the procedure laid down by civil procedural legislation.

Section III

THE POSITION OF RELIGIOUS ORGANIZATIONS WITH RESPECT TO PROPERTY

Article 17. The use of property that is owned by the state, public organizations, or citizens

Religious organizations have the right to use for their own needs buildings and property made available to them on a contractual basis by state and public organizations or citizens.

Local soviets of people's deputies and state organs may transfer to religious organizations as property or for use gratis cultural buildings and other property belonging to the state.

Religious organizations have a preferential right to have cultural buildings with their adjacent territory transferred to them.

Decisions on questions relating to the transfer of cultural buildings and property to religious organizations should be made no later than one month after the corresponding application is made, with simultaneous response in writing to those submitting the application.

The transfer to religious organizations of objects and articles that are historical and cultural monuments is carried out in accordance with legislation.

Religious organizations establish ownership and use of land according to the procedure laid down by law.

Article 18. Property of religious organizations

Religious organizations may own buildings, cult objects, facilities for production, social work, and charitable purposes, monetary assets, and other property essential for their activity.

Religious organizations have the right to own property acquired or created by them using their own assets donated by citizens and organizations or transferred by the state, and likewise assets acquired from other sources as provided by law.

Religious organizations may also own property abroad.

Religious organizations have the right to appeal for voluntary financial and other donations and to receive them.

Financial and property donations, and likewise other incomes of religious organizations, are tax exempt.

The right of ownership by religious organizations is protected by law.

Article 19. Production and economic activity of religious organizations

Religious organizations have the right in accordance with the law and their own charter (or statutes) to maintain publishing, printing, production, restoration-and-construction, agricultural, and other enterprises, and also charitable institutions (shelters, boarding schools, hospitals and so forth), which enjoy rights as legal entities.

Profit from production activity and other income from enterprises belonging to religious organizations are subject to tax in accordance with the legislation according to the procedure and at the rates laid down for enterprises belonging to public organizations.

Article 20. Disposition of the property of religious organizations that discontinue their activity

When religious organizations discontinue their activity the property made available for their use by any state or public organization or citizen is returned to the previous owner.

When religious organizations discontinue their activity the disposition of property that they own is carried out in accordance with the charter (or statutes) and existing legislation.

No penalty can be imposed or claim made by creditors against cult property.

In the event that no successor is found, property is transferred to state ownership.

Section IV

RIGHTS OF RELIGIOUS ORGANIZATIONS AND CITIZENS PERTAINING TO FREEDOM OF WORSHIP

Article 21. Religious rites and ceremonies

Religious organizations have the right to found and maintain freely accessible places for divine service or religious gatherings, and also places revered by a particular religion (places of pilgrimage).

Divine service and religious rites and ceremonies are conducted without hindrance in prayer buildings and on the territory belonging to them, at places of pilgrimage, in the establishments of religious organizations, at cemeteries and crematoriums, and in citizens' apartments and houses.

Command authorities in military units do not hinder participation in divine services or the fulfillment of religious rites by servicemen during their free time.

Divine service and religious rites in infirmaries, hospitals, homes for the aged and disabled, and in places of preliminary detention and places where sentences are served are conducted at the request of the citizens in them. The administrations of these establishments provide assistance in inviting clergymen, and they participate in determining the time and other conditions for holding divine service, rites, and ceremonies.

In other cases, public divine service and religious rites and ceremonies are conducted in accordance with the procedure established for holding gatherings, meetings, demonstrations, and processions.

Religious organizations have the right to submit proposals to conduct divine service to citizens in infirmaries, hospitals, homes for the aged and disabled, and places of confinement.

Article 22. Religious literature and religious objects

Citizens and religious organizations have the right to acquire and make use of religious literature in the language of their choice, and likewise other religious articles and materials.

Religious organizations have the right to produce, export, import, and disseminate religious articles, religious literature, and other informational materials that are religious in content.

Religious organizations enjoy an exclusive right to establish enterprises to publish religious literature and produce religious articles.

Article 23. Charitable and cultural-enlightenment activities of religious organizations

Societies, brotherhoods, associations, and other associations of citizens may be set up by religious organizations for the purpose of charitable activities and to study and disseminate religious literature, and for other cultural-enlightenment activity. They may have their own charters registered in accordance with the procedure laid down for public associations.

Religious organizations have the right to engage in charitable and philanthropic activity both independently and through public foundations.

Donations and payments for this purpose are not included in the sums liable for taxation.

Article 24. International ties and contacts by believers and religious organizations

Citizens and religious organizations have the right to establish and maintain, on either a group or individual basis, international ties and direct personal contacts, including trips abroad for pilgrimage or participation in meetings and other religious events.

Religious organizations may send citizens abroad to study in spiritual training establishments, and accept foreign citizens for this purpose.

Section V

LABOR ACTIVITY IN RELIGIOUS ORGANIZATIONS AND THEIR ENTERPRISES

Article 25. Labor legal relations in religious organizations

Religious organizations have the right to hire citizens for work.

Conditions of labor are set by agreement between the religious organization and the worker and are set forth in a labor contract concluded in written form.

The religious organization is obligated to register any labor contract in accordance with established procedure.

The same procedure is used to register documents defining salary conditions for ministers.

Citizens working in a religious organization under the terms of a labor contract may be members of trade unions.

Article 26. Labor rights of citizens working in religious organizations

The legislation covering labor applies to citizens working in religious organizations under a labor contract in the same way as for workers and employees in state and public enterprises, establishments, and organizations.

Income derived by citizens working in religious organizations, including ministers, is taxed in accordance with the rates set for workers and employees in state enterprises, establishments, and organizations.

Article 27. Labor legal relations of citizens at enterprises and establishments of religious organizations

Legislation on labor, tax procedure, social insurance, and social security for workers and employees in state and public enterprises, establishments, and organizations applies to citizens working at all enterprises and establishments of religious organizations, and also at charitable institutions that they set up.

Article 28. Social security and social insurance for citizens working in religious organizations

Citizens working in religious organizations, including ministers, enjoy the same social security and social insurance as workers and employees in state and public enterprises, establishments, and organizations.

To this end religious organizations and their enterprises and institutions make contributions to the state social insurance fund and the USSR pension fund in accordance with the procedure and at the rates set for public organizations and their enterprises and establishments.

All citizens working in religious organizations receive a state pension that is paid on the common basis in accordance with the legislation.

Section VI

STATE ORGANS AND RELIGIOUS ORGANIZATIONS

Article 29. State organs for religious affairs

The USSR state organ for religious affairs is an informational, consultative, and expert center. In this capacity it does the following:

—maintains contacts and coordinating ties with similar establishments in the Union and autonomous republics and abroad;

—creates a data bank on religious organizations in the USSR and on the exercise of legislation on freedom of conscience and religious organizations;

—sets up an expert council of religious experts, representatives of religious organizations, and experts on the problem of human rights in order to conduct religious expert assessments and if required to provide an official expert conclusion with regard to requests from organs of state management and the courts;

—at the request of religious organizations provides assistance in reaching agreements with state organs and all necessary help in matters requiring a decision by state organs;

—promotes the strengthening of mutual understanding and tolerance between religious organizations of different denominations within the country and abroad.

The USSR state organ for religious affairs is formed by the USSR Council of Ministers.

State organs for religious affairs are set up in the Union and autonomous republics and operate in accordance with legislation of the USSR and of the Union and autonomous republics.

Article 30. Responsibility for violations of legislation on freedom of conscience and religious organizations

Officials and citizens guilty of violations of legislation on freedom of conscience and religious organizations are liable as established by the legislation of the USSR and the Union and autonomous republics.

Article 31. International treaties

If an international treaty to which the USSR is a signatory has established rules other than those contained in the legislation on freedom of conscience and religious organizations, the rules of the international treaty shall apply.

[Signed] M. Gorbachev, president of the USSR
Moscow, the Kremlin, 1 October 1990

Politburo Issues Slogans for October Anniversary

PM2310154990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Oct 90 First Edition p 1

["CPSU Central Committee Politburo Slogans for the 73d Anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution"—SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA headline]

[Text] 1. Long live the 73d anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution!

2. Comrades! Let us be loyal to the ideals of October, let us defend Lenin's name and cause!

3. Communists! Struggle for the party's real renewal, for humane, democratic socialism!

4. Comrades! A rule-of-law state, economic progress, and spiritual rebirth are the main objectives of our policy!

5. Citizens of our multinational fatherland! The future of the USSR lies in the unity of sovereign republics! Yes to a new Union treaty!

6. Workers and peasants, working people of the Soviet Union! Conscientious labor and organization are the guarantee of the success of radical economic reform! Let us maintain the decisive tread of perestroyka—a program for the stabilization of the national economy and the transition to a market economy!

7. The defense of working people's interests and social justice are essential conditions of economic renewal!

8. Compatriots! Civic accord is the only road to the future! No to nationalism and separatism!

9. Communist people's deputies! Remember the voters' great trust, strengthen Soviet power! Direct your initiative and constructive and effective work in the soviets to the benefit of the people!

10. Scientific and cultural figures! Through your creative labor promote the country's progress and assert the ideals of good and humanism! Attach priority significance to the development of culture!

11. Soviet women! Actively promote peace in our common home and the spiritual recovery of the life of society!

12. Young men and women! Bear the name of citizen of the USSR with honor! Devote young people's intelligence and energy to the cause of perestroyka!

13. Komsomol [V.I. Lenin Communist Youth League] members! Be loyal to the ideals of October, assert in life humanist general human values!

14. Soviet soldiers! Strengthen organization and discipline, friendship and military comradeship, protect the people's creative labor!

15. Honor and homage to the generations of working people who created the fatherland and the servicemen who defended it!

16. Fraternal greetings to the communists, supporters of the socialist ideal, and all progressive forces of the world!

17. People of the world! Let us pool our efforts in resolving general human, global problems!

Aganbegyan Credits Gorbachev With Economic Plan

PM2210140790 Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 20 Oct 90 p 1

[Report by A. Kozhakhmetova: "President Proposes"]

[Text] The president kept his word. The draft program for the transition to the market which he has submitted is based on calculations made by the authors of alternative measures for economic recovery—S.S. Shatalin and L. Abalkin—along with the proposals made by members of the USSR Supreme Soviet during the September debates. Academician A. Aganbegyan's viewpoint has also been taken into consideration.

This new document was discussed for three days by the union parliament's committees and commissions, and yesterday at a joint sitting of the chambers in the Kremlin. M.S. Gorbachev delivered a report.

The day before, on Thursday, there was a kind of dress rehearsal—A. Aganbegyan addressed the members of several parliamentary commissions. He described the key points of the "Basic Guidelines" and answered a fair number of questions. The academician named the document's principal author—according to him, the "president himself." Explaining why his name was chosen for the draft, A. Aganbegyan remarked that no program should be imposed on any union republic: Only the logic of the actions should be agreed.

But the situation today is complicated by the fact (and the academician admitted this) that it is hard to calculate the course of reform even a few steps in advance. The reason being the dualism of the decisions adopted by union and republic organs of power, the "haze" over foreign credit, and so on.

A. Aganbegyan was asked about his attitude to B. Yeltsin's recent speech and to what the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet chairman said about the new program's deliberately deceiving the people by understating the state budget deficit figure. "I do not know where Boris Nikolayevich got these figures," the speaker replied. "His speech was political. Whatever program we had proposed, he would have said it all the same."

Yakovlev Asserts Viability of 'Socialist Idea'

LD1910180190 Moscow TASS in English 1739 GMT 19 Oct 90

[By TASS correspondent Mikhail Ivanov]

[Text] The socialist idea does not belong to socialists alone, Soviet Presidentual council member Aleksandr Yakovlev believes. It belongs to all humankind. Yakovlev was speaking at an international conference "Transformations in Eastern Europe: View of the Left Wing", which opened here today.

"If socialists do not implement it, others will embark on this path—with us or regardless of us," Yakovlev said. He said that the socialist idea can acquire new content and new essence, but that it was conceived under the influence of man's age-old striving for justice and dignity.

Yakovlev noted that nihilism with regard to everthing socialist is no less harmful and dangerous than self-glorification and conceit.

With the emergence of a new Europe, the psychology of war recedes to the past. The ideological and political split of europe can be overcome, Yakovlev said.

He believes that in this atmosphere the socialist idea can yield much to European peoples if it is implemented as a result of the democratic creativity of peoples.

Yakovlev is convinced that the revival of the socialist idea is inevitable and will take place soon, although it would be self-deception to expect it tomorrow.

"When this moment comes, will we think that all we have lived through, all that has been done earlier, was only deception and led us down a blind alley, or will we reassess the road covered", he asked.

Non-CPSU Democratic Platform Evolves

91UN0088A Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 13 Oct 90 p 1

[Article by Yu. Sorokin: "The 'Platform' on the Left"]

[Text]**We have already written about the part of the Democratic Platform that remained with the CPSU. Today we want to tell you about the other part of it, which "decided to leave home."**

At the 28th congress the Democratic Platform announced its withdrawal from the CPSU and its desire to set up an independent party. Now the organization is preparing a constituent congress, which is scheduled for November.

"Travkin's" Democratic Party of Russia has started out upon the familiar Lenin road: They began with a congress, followed by the publication of a mass newspaper, and then they organized local party groups. Unlike them, the Democratic Platform leaders hope to form the party comparatively swiftly from "below." While Travkin was starting from an empty place, the Democratic Platform already has its own, though brief, history. Party clubs and associations that support it can be found in over 100 cities. Regional conferences are expected to be held before the end of October, and they should select delegates to the congress, which will become the final stage in the creation of the party.

KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA has already written about the trip that a group of deputies, representatives of the Democratic Platform headed by Vladimir Lysenko, took around the cities of Siberia and Far East. Similar "campaign trips" were conducted in the Central and Volga regions and Kuban. The leaders of the Democratic Platform travel with a whole entourage, without which any new-born political structure seems to be impossible these days. They carry registration forms (a kind of party membership cards), sample applications and resolutions, and samples of documents one needs to start a bank account or to register the organization with the local soviet. Distributors of the newspaper ISKRA at the turn of the century used false-bottomed suitcases for this purpose, but now—here is a sign of the times—all the propaganda, together with the accounting, can be put on two computer diskettes.

At the same time they use any opportunity—dozens of meetings, radio, TV, and interviews to local newspapers—to explain why the Democratic Platform withdrew from the CPSU. The party organs are practically helpless in their attempts to prevent this from happening. On the contrary, they have to provide accommodation for the "discussions." The discussions, however, rather quickly switch to convincing propaganda for withdrawal from the CPSU. Rare individuals who are brave enough to try to defend the CPSU cannot find equally convincing arguments to counter them, and they are not helped even by their premises: "Baroque" party buildings seen against the background of pitiful box-like houses serve as an illustration of the Democratic Platform's claims.

It seems that the Democratic Platform gained more than it lost from its defeat at the congress. Its slogans continue to be popular: Party organizations should be removed from industry and also from state institutions, the Army, the Ministry of Internal Affairs, and the KGB; the CPSU should give up its absolute monopoly on the publishing base and the mass media. Most of the party's property should be given voluntarily to the people. The longer the CPSU adheres to "privileges" that have become more than doubtful from the public point of view, the higher the prestige of the Democratic Platform will rise.

Essentially these issues are fundamental for the entire democratic movement now because they deal with power. The 19th party conference discussed the transfer of power to the soviets, but the decisions of the 28th congress show an abrupt turn in the general line. The 28th congress unequivocally displayed its treatment of the power issue as it confirmed party control over the Army, the government, and even the president who,

being also the general secretary, has to obey party discipline. The congress stated that communist deputies have to vote according to party decisions, and insisted that the publishing base and press owned by the party (and there is no other, practically) cannot be used for the purposes of other political forces. Even if the number of CPSU members drops dramatically, the party machine will still preserve a reliable financial base.

The coordinating council recently adopted a special appeal to communists calling on them to leave the party. ("The CPSU invites them in and we invite them out," said Lysenko).

Here is a curious fact: For the first time in politics, it seems, the Democratic Platform ran into the problem of "patent protection" for its own name. As you know, just after the appearance of V.N. Shostakovskiy at the 28th congress when he read the Democratic Platform statement on its withdrawal from the CPSU, G.G. Gusev took the floor and declared that the Democratic Platform never made or supported such a decision. To put it mildly, this declaration was not quite true, and several days later, during a rally in front of the Manezh, democrats gave 30 metal rubles, a reminder of the biblical pieces of silver, to Gusev and labelled his declaration a "provocation" which had been "planned beforehand in the Central Committee." All the world's a stage...

Several people, however, were in reality part of the leading bodies of the CPSU Central Committee and the Russian Communist Party Central Committee and now speak in the name of the CPSU Democratic Platform, but from entirely different positions. The pages of party publications are at their complete disposal.

All this creates a lot of confusion, and our people are developing double vision: There was one Democratic Platform, and now there are two, and the one that calls for the withdrawal from the CPSU cannot dissociate itself from the other. It cannot find any outlet either on the radio, TV, or in the party press.

The Democratic Platform (non-CPSU) has failed so far in setting up a more or less large-scale newspaper without which the organization can hardly achieve a truly high political rating. And another problem: There are dozens of local dwarf "parties" and "forums," and it all results in a struggle of egos that often replaces politics.

Recently, however, the newspaper of the Democratic Party of Russia (we are told it is "paid for by Travkin and Kasparov"), which already comes out in a million copies, has announced that it intends to be a mouthpiece for all parties and forces with democratic goals. The three most well-known organizations—the Democratic Party of Russia, the Social Democratic party of Russia, and the Democratic Platform—agreed to form a joint political coalition. Its goals are support for the economic program of the Russian Government, resignation of the Union Government, and the formation of a coalition government of public trust. The sides agree to coordinate their political actions and to form joint factions in the soviets. They also asked their supporters to "avoid unconstructive and disloyal criticism of each other."

It is difficult to judge whether these organizations are capable of becoming parties in the full meaning of the word. As you know, this process does not end with the constituent congress. We do not have civilized political traditions, our society is totally homogeneous, and until now we have not had any large groups of population with their own, well-outlined interests which the parties should represent. Their programs are similar in essence. When an individual joins one or the other party he is not attracted by the party program but by the political leader at the head of it.

The decisions of the 28th congress were described as historic in the press. There is every reason to believe that this time history had a somewhat different design in mind.

Shenin Says Defense Ministry To Pay Servicemen

PM1910161190 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 19 Oct 90 First Edition p 1

[Report by KRASNAYA ZVEZDA correspondent Lieutenant Colonel V. Zyubin under the "Direct Line" rubric: "Operating in the New Conditions"]

[Text] Moscow—O.S. Shenin, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, held a news conference on 17 October at the CPSU Central Committee Press Center for Soviet and foreign journalists.

In a brief introductory address O.S. Shenin broached a number of topical questions regarding the progress made in implementing the 28th CPSU Congress decisions and restructuring party work. One of our main concerns, he stressed, is to determine our position in the new conditions and do everything to ensure that the party begins to work better. First, it is necessary to mobilize primary organizations. A commission has been set up with this in view to renew the activity of primary party organizations. The question of setting up a council of CPSU primary organization secretaries is being considered.

Answers were then given to numerous questions from Soviet and foreign journalists. Our correspondent asked a number of questions concerning Articles 5 and 16 of the USSR Law "On Public Associations."

As of 1 January next year (the time the law comes into force) who is to pay the Army and Navy party officials who are to be released? O.S. Shenin said that all servicemen must pay for party activity out of the party budget; as for remuneration for rank and other additional payments, they are, as before, to come from the USSR Defense Ministry. He pointed out that all parties must exist under equal conditions.

Does Article 16 of this law not restrict the CPSU's opportunities to implement its policy in the Army and

Navy? O.S. Shenin pointed out that a situation can hardly occur where party decisions contravene constitutional norms. At its 28th congress the CPSU said that it operates in accordance with the laws, in accordance with the Constitution. If a party committee or party organization abandons these positions, it is certainly right for an officer or servicemen to act in accordance with the law.

O.S. Shenin also said that he does not regard the article of the law in question as a step toward the removal of the party from the Armed Forces. We simply need to live under the new law just as we live under the new party statutes. Since we say that we advocate a rule-of-law state, we will act accordingly. Conditions must not be created, he stressed, where bans on professions or a ban on work in party organizations become possible. This depends in many respects on how our party and all other new parties observe the law.

Shenin on CPSU Journal's Plans for 1991

PM1910145690 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Oct 90 First Edition p 5

[Interview with O.S. Shenin, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, by unnamed TASS correspondent; date and place not given: "IZVESTIYA TSK KPSS: Program for the Future"]

[Text] [PRAVDA] Oleg Semenovich! The journal IZVESTIYA TSK KPSS, where you are a member of the editorial council, is entering a severe competitive struggle with many other publications currently filling the country's market for printed products. The first results of the subscription campaign are already known, and they have been depressing for many party publications. Isn't the editorial council afraid that the Central Committee's information journal will not be able to withstand the competition or keep its subscribers?

[Shenin] The journal's editorial council is quite calm about the prospects for IZVESTIYA TSK. Judging by the editorial mailbag, the publication has identified its range of readers, which it does not intend to relinquish. Here are some lines from several letters which have literally just arrived at the Central Committee General Department's Information and Publishing Group. This group is charged with publishing the journal. "I continue to subscribe to the journal," G.V. Leshko of Dnepropetrovsk writes. "I am convinced that it is needed not only by every Communist but by every person interested in the history and modern life of the party and the country." "I have been happy with the contents of the journal since it first started publication," Ye.V. Berusov of Rostov-na-Donu writes. "I will be continuing to read it." Of course, we are prepared for a certain fall-off in the journal's print run.

[PRAVDA] Don't you think that the fall-off in the journal's print run might also be caused by factors such as the drop in the party's prestige and people's general weariness with politics? And, in general, are you sure that anyone now is interested in what goes on at Staraya Ploshchad [Central Committee headquarters]?

[Shenin] There is no doubt that the antiparty and anticommunist hysteria that has been whipped up by some of the mass media and certain politicians will leave its mark. But I think it would be quite wrong to say that what goes on at the CPSU Central Committee will be of little interest to readers. Communists are still the ruling party and have a majority in the soviets.

[PRAVDA] What information will readers of the journal be able to glean on the CPSU Central Committee's activities?

[Shenin] Above all, the journal plans to publish stenographic records of CPSU Central Committee and Central Control Commission plenums and resolutions from the party's leading organs. I would like to stress that publication of these documents will be accompanied by analysis notes from Central Committee departments and other preparatory materials (sociological, statistical, and so forth).

Perestroyka in the party, the experience of the acquisition of political methods of leadership, and the work of Communist factions in the soviets will be covered by items under the following new rubrics: "The CPSU on the Path of Renewal," "CPSU Cadres," "The Party and the Soviets," "The CPSU's Nationalities Policy," and "Political Forecast." The journal will report on new political parties, social movements, and the CPSU's position with regard to them.

The appearance in the political arena of forces which have announced their political opposition to the CPSU has dictated the appearance of a new rubric—"Answering Political Opponents." Its authors will be Central Committee members and party leaders.

[PRAVDA] Subscribers are invariably interested in the rubric "At IZVESTIYA TSK KPSS Readers' Request." Will it be retained in the journal in 1991?

[Shenin] Yes it will, and it will continue to carry replies to the most topical questions of sociopolitical life. Incidentally, I would like to call on all readers to actively participate in the preparation of this rubric—any questions put to the Information and Publishing Group in writing or by phone will be noted and used in the articles.

Incidentally, there will be substantial changes to the "CPSU Central Committee Mailbag" rubric. Whereas previously the journal used to basically familiarize readers with analytical overviews of letters, we will now be publishing the thoughts of party organ leaders on the Central Committee mailbag, letters with commentaries by Central Committee members and Central Committee apparatus workers, and analyses of the replies to letters received from various organs. A number of highly interesting letters from the Central Committee archives have

been selected. These include letters from A.D. Sakharov, A.I. Solzhenitsyn, and A.T. Tvardovskiy.

History in letters. That is what one could call the planned publication of a selection of appeals to Stalin from repressed Communists: Bukharin, Yenukidze, Zinovyev, Kamenev, Krestinskiy, Pyatakov, Radek, and others, as well as letters from famous writers—Sholokhov, Pasternak, Bulgakov...

[PRAVDA] The historical, archive section of the journal has always been of great interest. What can readers expect next year?

[Shenin] Given that interest in the history of the party and the country is increasingly shifting closer to our period, it is planned to acquaint readers with documents from the fifties to seventies. The veil of secrecy will finally be lifted from the stenographic records of the Central Committee plenums which examined the "Beriya case" and discussed the events connected with the antiparty Malenkov, Kaganovich, and Molotov group, Marshal Zhukov's disgrace, and Khrushchev's resignation.

However the twenties and thirties will not go unnoticed either. I have no doubt that the stenographic records of the Central Committee plenums in January 1924, the history of Trotskiy's expulsion from the party, and the notorious February-March plenum of 1937 will be of interest to readers.

Moreover, subscribers will be able to familiarize themselves with archive documents covering party discussions in the twenties, the history of collectivization and the Great Patriotic War, the development of Soviet nuclear weapons and the debate on genetics, and the first steps toward the idea of economic reform in the country.

Those, in brief, are the plans for 1991. But, needless to say, they will be amended to take account of the wishes of our new subscribers. I am sure that, together with them, we will be able to create the party journal that the party and society need today.

Moscow Court Adjourns Kalugin Hearing

LD2310112690 Moscow TASS in English 1019 GMT 23 Oct 90

[By TASS correspondent Igor Peskov]

[Text] Moscow October 23 TASS—The court in Moscow today adjourned hearing the case ensuing from the complaint by former KGB Major-General Oleg Kalugin, who is now a Soviet people's deputy, against KGB chief Vladimir Kryuchkov actions. As a result of these actions, Kalugin was stripped of his pension.

The decision to adjourn was made by the Moscow City Court as "no response has been received by the court from the USSR Council of Ministers which was requested to submit to the court copies of the documents which provided the basis for stripping Kalugin of his military rank, which, in turn, provided the basis for cancelling the payment of a military retirement pension to Oleg Kalugin".

In addition, the court has not received information from the chief military procuracy about the stage of consideration of "the criminal case concerning the divulging of military secrets in the former KGB general's pronouncements in the press".

The Moscow City Court first met to consider the case on October 2. The next meeting will take place on November 11.

"They obviously intend to proscrastinate," Kalugin told TASS after the adjournment was announced. "I believe that the court's attempts to link the case of stripping me of the military rank and my pension with the criminal case under investigation in the military procuracy are aimed at speeding up the criminal proceedings in order to use the criminal court's decision to legalize the annulment of my pension".

Trade Unions Exempt From Organizations Law

914F0011A Moscow TRUD in Russian 11 Oct 90 p 2

[Report on interviews with S. Shalayev, USSR people's deputy from the trade unions, and K. Lubenchenko, member of the USSR Supreme Soviet, by V. Konstantinov: "The High Price of Correction"]

[Excerpts] **As has already been reported in TRUD, the country's legislature has adopted the USSR law "On Social Associations." One can say without exaggeration that the attention of the entire "trade union" community was riveted to the discussion of this draft law in the Supreme Soviet (and it was not simple and involved heated debates). And this is understandable: Initially the draft contained provisions that clearly "stuck out" from the overall process of democratization of life in the country and restricted the trade unions—the largest organization of workers—even in those rights they had before. But still common sense prevailed... The way the discussion of the draft law went and how the activity of trade unions should be regulated in a rule-of-law state are discussed by USSR people's deputies.**

S. SHALAYEV, USSR people's deputy from the trade unions:

As we know, beginning with the Sixth All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions [AUCCTU] Plenum, Soviet trade unions entered upon a course toward radical restructuring of all of their activity and began to achieve real autonomy and independence from any party, economic, and state organs. Only such trade unions are capable of becoming a real point of support for the workers and defenders of their rights and interests under the conditions of the market. And one must say that the changes in the trade union movement have not gone unnoticed. For example, the attempt to "push" through the legislature the draft law on social associations in its

initial form may, in my opinion, be regarded as the desire on the part of certain forces to "take" the trade unions "in hand" and legislatively "consecrate" and reinforce for a long time their subordinate, supervised position in the country.

The draft law placed the trade unions in the same category with any other social organizations, and articles 11 (on the procedure for registering social associations), 20 (on monitoring and supervising their activity), and 22 (on the procedure for eliminating social associations) not only essentially abandoned the principle of independence of trade unions but also directly contradicted, for example, the provisions of the convention of the International Labor Organization, which was ratified by the USSR and the norms accepted in all civilized countries concerning relations between the state and the trade unions. In Belgium the Constitution guarantees all citizens the right to create associations without registering them. Even the king cannot disband a legally created union. In Sweden neither the trade unions nor their bylaws are subject to registration, state organs do not have the right to disband trade unions, and the amounts of their strike funds are completely secret.

It is understandable that the draft law submitted to the Supreme Soviet was discriminatory with respect to the Soviet trade unions, which has been pointed out, incidentally, not only by our community but also by the foreign community. Therefore, the position of the USSR people's deputies from the trade unions, supported by a number of other legislators, were firm: The law on social associations should not apply to trade unions. The very nature of the activity and purposes of the trade unions, which are in contact with state and government organs each day, guarding the interests of the working people, tell of their special role in the society. Those who followed the session saw that the activity of "trade union" deputies met with equally active opposition. The amendment taking the trade unions from the "tutelage" of the state was brought up for a vote six times. And ultimately justice triumphed. In the decree of the USSR Supreme Soviet "On Putting Into Effect the Law 'On Social Associations,'" they included an amendment that establishes that the peculiarities in the regulation of issues pertaining to the registration of the bylaws of unions and monitoring of their activity are envisioned by legislation on trade unions. It seems that the heated discussion that took place also helped many legislators clarify more deeply the special role and importance of the tasks being carried out by the trade unions.

K. LUBENCHENKO, member of the USSR Supreme Soviet: [subhead]

[Passage omitted]

Certain legislators—including some who are skeptical about the trade unions' claim to special rights—build their arguments on the current condition of the trade union movement, the conservative nature of the AUCCTU, and so forth. Without getting into an evaluation of the activity of the AUCCTU, I will just say that one cannot approach legislative activity from the positions of the past, from the positions of a specific time. One must understand that the trade unions could not have been different before now. After the changeover to the market, life itself and the economy will not allow them to stand still.

The Supreme Soviet acted correctly by putting the trade unions outside the framework of the law that regulates the activity of social associations and pointing out that the trade unions must live according to their own special law. The draft of this law—"On the Rights of USSR Trade Unions"—as we know, is now being discussed in the committees and commissions of the Supreme Soviet. How our entire society will develop will depend to no small degree on what kind of a law this is, whether it will strengthen the trade unions or restrict their activity, whether it will help to gain independence or become another yoke.

Liberal-Democratic Party Elects Leaders

LD2010222190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1758 GMT 20 Oct 90

[By TASS correspondent Ruben Shirinyan]

[Text] Moscow, 20 Oct (TASS)—Rule changes and the election of new members of the Central Committee were the main issues at the conference of the Liberal-Democratic Party of the Soviet Union (LDP), which took place in Moscow today.

The LDP, set up six months ago, considers itself "the party of common sense" and sets as its aim the creation of a law-based state "via the multi-party system and private ownership." The party is also establishing international links. Its representatives have spent time in a number of European countries and have taken part in the work of the congress of liberals international, which took place in Helsinki at the beginning of October.

It was reported at the conference that, taking advantage of the party's chairman trip abroad, a number of LDP members held an "emergency session of the party" on 6 October at which Vladimir Zhirnovskiy was subjected to sharp criticism "for political unscrupulousness" and was released from his duties as LDP chairman; and a new party leadership was elected.

In connection with this, Vladimir Zhirnovskiy spoke, accusing two influential LDP members of embezzling party resources and property. He refuted press reports that an emergency party congress had taken place in Moscow on 6 October. According to him, it was merely "a gathering of around 40 citizens of whom half were guests or observers" which took place on that day.

A new party Central Committee was elected at the conference, which included representatives of eight of

the country's republics. It was announced that the party chairman is, as before, Vladimir Zhirnovskiy.

Mining Industry Fears Market Transition

LD2010204890

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1800 GMT on 20 October in the "Vremya" newscast caries a two-minute report by Correspondent Kondaurov on the forthcoming national miners congress in Donetsk on 22 October.

Everyone involved in the coal mining industry is concerned about the effect the market will have on coal mining, Kondaurov says.

Kondaurov continues: "The ministry thinks that the sector ought to remain state property and that it should be managed from the center. The miner is worried that the mine where he works may close; after all, economists think that in the tough conditions of the market, only four of over 150 mines in the Donbass may be truly profitable. Subsidies are needed, three times more than now, that is to say 25 billion rubles [r]". He wonders whether the state will give the money. Kondaurov goes on to state that the more coal output falls, the greater the demand for it and in villages second-hand dealers are selling a "car of coal for R500-r700", noting that "a huge number of pits are on the verge of bankruptcy."

He then interviews miners who put their worries and complaints to him. One miner points out that "a tonne of coal costs R1.35" that is how much he receives for it, while a packet of cigarettes in the market costs R5. Other miners complain generally of the bad working conditions and the lack of goods in the shops.

"In Donetsk today shops began to sell produce and goods only on display of an identity card. But even with that there is nothing to buy, since people are afraid that with the transition to the market prices will rise sharply and literally are emptying the shops," Kondaurov says.

"At the second congress, we will set the task of creating our independent trade union, so that in the conditions of the market it is able to defend us, since the present one simply is not able to do that," M.A. Krylov, shaft sinker and member of the Donetsk strike committee says.

Baklanov Attends Party Meeting at MiG Plant

PM2210150190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Oct 90 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Conference at Plant"]

[Text] A party conference was held at the I.A. Mikoyan Moscow Machine-building Plant, where the famous MiG aircraft are made. The following questions were the focus of the delegates' attention: What should the party organization be involved with in the enterprise, the shop, and the department in the current situation, and what new forms of party work should be used.

The main idea expressed was that every communist represents part of the party, so the party's prestige and its place in sociopolitical life depends on the work, conduct and, to be honest, the example of the individual. Decisions were taken on the new structure of the enterprise party organization, the budget, and the complement of leading workers.

O.D. Baklanov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, gave an address at the conference.

Kalmykov Discusses Public Associations Law

91UN0028A Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 3 Oct 90 p 1

[Commentary by Yu. Kalmykov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee on Legislation: "A Monopoly on Power Will Not Be Tolerated"]

[Text]*It is presumed that as of 1 January 1991 the new Law on Public Associations in the USSR will enter into force. On Monday a draft version of this law was presented for discussion among members of the Union parliament. At the request of our correspondent A. Kozhakhmetova, commentary on the main provisions of the new draft law is specially provided for RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA readers by Yu. Kalmykov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee on Legislation.*

Normative acts in effect until now which regulate the activity of various public associations in our country are antiquated. They were adopted long ago at the beginning of the 1930's. And therefore our draft law (I say "our" since it was drawn up by the Committee on Legislation) is intended to establish a unified legal basis for the activity of all associations. This includes political parties, mass social movements, professional and creative unions, voluntary societies, etc. This is an all-Union law, and it must be precisely that.

It must be noted, however, that the law will contain direct- action norms applicable only to all-Union, inter-republic, and international associations of citizens—which is in keeping with declarations on sovereignty. The most diverse issues can be resolved by the republics themselves.

The process whereby public associations are registered in the various republics can also be varied. But if one organization or another is an all-Union one, then it can be registered only with organs of the USSR Justice Ministry. This issue, incidentally, has evoked much argument among members of the working group that prepared the draft. We also attempted to check out the experience of other countries. There the record is diverse—some proceed from the premise that public associations should be registered by state organs, while others believe this a matter for the courts. Our courts are crammed full with cases. They have a catastrophic lack of specialists, and it would be simply impossible to impose these additional functions on the courts. Soviets of various levels have to this point registered new

societies—but they have been societies, and not parties, although calling themselves parties on occasion.

We have not tried to fully elaborate the characteristics of various organizations in the draft law. But, taking into account the desires of deputies expressed during the first reading of the draft, we identified the three most powerful categories: political parties, mass social movements, and trade unions. The law also reflects the basic features of each category. Parties express the political will of their members and set as their main task participation in the formation of organs of state power. Mass movements may also participate in such activity, but in the majority of instances they have other aims—the ecological movement, the women's movement, youth movement, etc.

The most difficult matter was to determine the status and procedure for registering trade unions. The unions themselves oppose having to operate under procedure as envisaged by this draft law, i.e., they want everything to remain as before. We hold another point of view—that all trade unions, or at least their regulations, must be registered according to a single law on public associations.

Finally, what is most important. The new law states clearly and concisely that all political parties in the USSR are equal and must exist under the same conditions. A monopoly on power will not be tolerated.

Journalist's Relations With Soviets Reviewed

PM2310133590 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 23 Oct 90 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Displaying Mutual Tact"]

[Text] The law "On the press and other mass media" adopted by the USSR Supreme Soviet entered into force 1 August.

Henceforth it would seem that relations between founders, editorial office, publisher, and reader should be determined by the law and only by the law.

Yet, as the statement by the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Questions of Glasnost and Citizens' Rights and Appeals notes, the committee is receiving alarm calls about the existence of serious disputes between journalists' collectives and founders and leaders of local soviets. In a number of oblasts and cities the struggle is being aggravated between party and soviet organs for the right to own the mass media. The rayon press has found itself in an extremely difficult position.

Some soviets of people's deputies are trying to put pressure on the press.

No less alarming, the document continues, are cases where the press is being pressured by unruly rally emotions: intolerance, the desire of some public movements come what may to dictate their will to the mass media, which is in direct contradiction with the freedom of the press proclaimed by the law.

There are cases where journalists are discriminated against depending on their party allegiance. Such instances are a gross violation of the USSR Constitution.

The process of registering periodical publications already existence is proceeding with difficulty. Individual newspaper and journal labor collectives are expressing reluctance to work with organs which were previously viewed as their founders. To a certain degree this process is natural, and of course it cannot proceed painlessly. But we believe that it is essential to do everything to ensure that in this process emotions and ambitions do not prevail over common sense and that such disputes are resolved in a businesslike atmosphere on a legal basis and primarily with a consideration for readers' interests.

The situation is also aggravated to the extreme by the fact that the press is essentially the first to switch to market relations. The increase in the cost of the services of the Ministry of Communications, of paper, and of printing work has led to an increase in prices for periodical publications, which is a particularly heavy blow to the poor strata of the population. The promises of responsible workers in the USSR Council of Ministers apparatus to consider the question of partial compensation to the population for expenditure on subscription have remained only promises. As a result a very grave blow is being struck against glasnost. The raising of prices and the reduction of the duration of the subscription campaign is leading to a sharp decline in print runs, which will place a number of publications, including those which have made a considerable contribution to the development of Soviet culture, on the verge of closure. And if today we are speaking seriously of the need to defend and support culture under market conditions, then this should also apply to printed publications.

Under the conditions which have taken shape the committee has deemed it necessary to extend the duration of the subscription campaign until at least 15 November.

The press has found itself in a grave position today. Nonetheless we believe that all problems should be resolved on the basis of the existing law "on the press and the other mass media," the statement stresses.

Under the conditions of the nascent multiparty system all organizations, including the organs of Soviet power, cannot build their policy on confrontation with the press.

The USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Questions of Glasnost and Citizens' Rights and Appeals has urged the founders of the mass media, the editorial offices, and publishers to display mutual tact, proceeding from the premise that in all cases it is necessary to be honest to the reader.

Writers Union Files Suit on ZNAMYA Registration

LD2010040190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1900 GMT 19 Oct 90

[Text] The hearing of a case initiated by an action of the USSR Writers Union and Goskompechat, the country's Media Ministry [Ministerstvo pechati massovoy informatsii strany], over the "Znamya" magazine started today.

The Writers Union does not agree with the fact that the magazine has been registered as an independent publication, whose founder is now the collective of the magazine's editorial staff.

Previously, the USSR Writers Union was regarded as it's founder.

Editor Views Trial, Writers Union

91UN0105A Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian No 42, 17 Oct 90 p 2

[Report on interview with Grigoriy Baklanov, editor-in-chief of ZNAMYA magazine, by Irina Rishina: "Passions for Establishment"]

[Text] [Rishina] The report in the last issue of our newspaper to the effect that coming up in the Moscow city court is a case (following the LITERATURNAYA GAZETA report, the program "Vremya" clarified that it will begin in 19 October) whose "hero" is the magazine ZNAMYA, which immediately evoked responses showing confusion and disturbance on the part of both readers and writers: What is the problem? Is the Writers Union really undertaking another trial, and not a trial by peers, as in the recent past, but a more scathing one—this time they are even submitting a statement of claim! What really is going on, Grigoriy Yakovlevich?

[Baklanov] First of all I should like to remind you that the magazine ZNAMYA appeared in 1931, that is, before the Writers Union did, which, as we know, was formed in 1934, and not only was it not the founder of ZNAMYA, but it did not invest a single kopeck in it during the entire time of its existence. At the very beginning I should probably clarify certain other aspects that I am not sure the writers know. Until I joined the editorial staff I had a very imprecise idea of them. For example, who received the profit, say, from the magazine ZNAMYA? The USSR Writers Union? The USSR Literary Fund? No, unless, of course, you count the small percentages for authors honoraria. The publishing house kept all the profit. And even if they managed to increase the circulation five-fold and incomes, ten-fold, neither the workers of the editorial staff nor the Literary Fund gained anything from it. That is the way it always was. The publishing house (not the Writers Union, but Pravda Publishing House) paid wages to workers on the staff of the magazine—regardless of the results of their labor. And the author received an honorarium in the amount prescribed above and the editorial staff did not have the right to increase it of its own accord. Incidentally, one of the goals pursued by the collective when they intended to make ZNAMYA an independent forum was, having received the opportunity to dispose of their own funds, to increase both the honoraria and the contributions to the Literary Fund. Not to the Union of Writers—here we can check to make sure the money is not used for measures that merely create a good appearance—but to the Literary Fund itself, whose function it is to look out for literary people. Speaking on television, I discussed in particular the fact that if the subscription campaign justified our hopes, then, in addition to everything else, we would establish specially designated scholarships for students at the Literary Institute. I should note in passing that the telegrams that leaders of the union dispersed by the thousands to writers of the country with the question, are you against separating a number of publications from the Writers Union or do you think this is permissible, in general misinform the recipients because it is not explained to the people that, when they gain their independence, the editorial staffs will be able to give them much larger and more appreciable amounts of support. Therefore, one cannot regard the separation of publications from the Union of Writers as an attempt to undermine the material and financial basis for the activity of the Literary Fund. On the contrary, we are in favor of strengthening it. And I am convinced that the writers only stand to gain from having the union apparatus assume the roles of intermediary and distributor of these funds.

But let me return to our immediate history. When the Law on the Press granted the editorial staffs the right to become founders themselves, the ZNAMYA collective, naturally, decided to take advantage of it and we submitted an application to the USSR State Committee for the Press. Later it turned out that the USSR Writers Union laid claim to this mission, of founder, as did the collectives of Pravda Publishing House and its printing facilities. After the Writers Union declared its intention, we had two meetings with the leaders (Karpov, Kolov, and Zotov). We suggested variants whereby the Literary Fund would participate directly in the financial aspect of the matter. They were all rejected. Moreover, in the USSR State Committee for the Press Kolov, said that they, that is the Writers Union, would join with Pravda against us. For what purpose? It turns out that they wanted to take away from the writers the funds that we would allote them and turn them over to Pravda Publishing House. To the credit of the publishing house and the Central Committee administration of affairs, they, taking into account the needs of the writers, abandoned their claims to being the founder. The union did not withdraw its application and right before the beginning of the subscription campaign the USSR State Committee for the Press announced: The magazine ZNAMYA is not registered. Our telephones nearly rang off their hooks with calls from readers: Are they going to register you or not? Should we subscribe or not? Who is the founder? For whose program will we be paying our money? Their uneasiness is quite well founded. After all, what is a

founder? He has the right to halt publication without giving any reasons, he can change the program, and so forth. The readers were alarmed, and further negotiations with the Union of Writers were impossible because Karpov had flown to Seoul, Kolov and one other secretary of the board to Beijing, and Kolov's recently appointed assistant, Zotov, was in Paris. This is what the union leaders did, and they themselves forced us to appeal to the Russian ministry: We were obliged to think about the magazine, about the subscribers, and about our author-writers. A number of other literary publications did the same thing.

The Law on the Press is valuable because it gives any organ the right to be independent. I am speaking about all of the image of the publication and its position. Ultimately, regardless of the assistance the newspapers and magazines render to the writers through the Literary Fund, one main thing for them is the publication of their works and the other main thing is for them to be able to select the press organ that corresponds to their views, their tastes, and their predilections. The leaders of the Writers Union has essentially declared that it is in favor of the strict, command method. If all the magazines are, as before, subordinate to one center that will dictate what is allowed and what is not—this is failure. To line everyone up in single file and make everyone work on command—we have already had a system like this in literature. And today we must be careful to make sure that things do not turn out as predicted in the letter from Fadeyev before he died: "Literature has been placed in the hands of untalented, petty, and rancorous people."

The writers must understand: This is a turning point in the history of the union. Quite recently we saw what happened to the magazine OKTYABR, how conditions were dictated to it, and how they tried to influence the editor and started to ostracize him even for what he did not publish. These persecutions confirmed that the past is alive and the old canons have not been destroyed. The same thing is happening in our union as is happening in the ministries that use any means not to let go of enterprises, the same thing as is happening on the state and collective farms where they will not accept lessees and farmers.

I repeat: This is a dangerous moment in the creative life of the writers and they must be fully aware of this. We know that there have been disgraceful court cases in the history of the Writers Union: against authors and against manuscripts... But, as far as I understand it, the Union has never tried to take a magazine to court, bringing it into submission by force. With these actions the leaders are demonstrating that they are prepared to do anything for the sake of power. The goal is important and it justifies any means.

Everything passes. We have no doubt that we shall survive. But the fact that the registration of a magazine went to court will remain in the history of the Writers Union. And, after all, the leadership has just repented, after the fact, for the disgraceful things that took place in the writers organization's past. But the sad lessons are being forgotten, unfortunately, and the Union of Writers will take the same path again.

[Rishina] The working leaders of the Writers Union, as we can see, seem to have a strange attitude toward LITERATURNAYA GAZETA as well. Last week—Moscow literary circles are already buzzing about this—the working secretariat considered the question of publishing a new newspaper, DEN, headed by A. Prokhanov. As you will recall, he was an alternate candidate nominated by the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Writers Union when they approved the candidacy of F. Burlatskiy, who was nominated by LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, for the secretariat of the "large" union.

[Baklanov] I, as a secretary and a member of the bureau of the secretariat, was not informed of the fact that the Writers Union intended to publish a new newspaper as an alternative to the present LITERATURNAYA GAZETA. I do not think that Aytmatov, Bykov, Voznesenskiy, Yevtushenko, or other secretaries were aware of this either. When they approved the new editor of LITERATURNAYA GAZETA they convened the enlarged group of the secretariat more than once. They telephoned the secretaries who could not attend in order to find out their opinions, they received telegrams and letters from them, and so forth. This is an unprecedented case in the history of the union, in which the working secretariat is considering the question of publishing a new organ so hastily and behind closed doors. In my opinion, they themselves do not understand what they are doing.

[Rishina] I actually mentioned this new newspaper DEN because this idea, as they say, came through at the meeting: Could they not house the editorial staff where LITERATURNAYA GAZETA is now, and throw us, who have given the Union of Writers millions upon millions, out onto the street?...

[Baklanov] Listen, that is amazing. For it was with this wish that our conversation with Karpov began when he and Kolov came to the ZNAMYA editorial offices for negotiations. Karpov, our author—we had recently published some of his work—and my classmate at the Literary Institute, walked through the offices and said: "Well, we will have to drive you out of here." I noted: "Wait, did you give us these premises? Did the union give them to us?" They were given to us by Pravda Publishing House. There is not a single thing that belongs to the Union of Writers here. I took Karpov's words "we will drive you out of here" as a joke. It turns out that he was serious.

Karpov submitted the statement of claim to the court on behalf of the Writers Union. But do the secretaries of the union know about this? Incidentally, we have three secretaries of the board on our editorial staff: Yu. Drunina, Yu. Chernichenko, and myself. We also have members of the board: S. Yesin, Yu. Zhukov, and V.

Kondratyev. On the editorial board of the magazine are S. Averintsev, V. Lakshin, V. Makanin, Ya. Khelemskiy... The ZNAMYA authors are excellent, esteemed writers. So will the court case regarding the magazine be on their behalf as well?

Although we in the editorial office are absolutely sure we are right, we, of course, do not want this trial to take place. The union leaders still have time to think and moderate their ambitions...

PRAVDA Attracts Only 500,000 Subscribers

LD1810174190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 18 Oct 90

[Text] [Announcer] The subcription campaign for newspapers and journals is coming to an end. We tried to get Soyuzpechat to tell us how things are going at the moment but apparently they do not have interim figures. So, we offer you some information supplied by ARGUMENTY I FAKTY. Here is Nikolay Zitkov, deputy editor-in-chief of the newspaper:

[Zitkov] I can give you precise information about the leading publications. Our newspaper is ahead with 7.5 million subscribers. TRUD is in second place with 5 million, and KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA is third with 4.1 million. These are the figures up to 1 October. I can't tell you who is last in the table. It is interesting to see that, among those publications which have been attracting attention, OGONEK and PRAVDA for example are vying with each other, somewhere in the second half of the table, I think. OGONEK has attracted only 400,000 subscribers and PRAVDA 500,000. These figures are manifestly far below last year's figures, roughly 9 percent and 7 percent, respectively, of last year's levels.

Subscriptions 'Drastically' Reduced

PM2410114790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Oct 90 First Edition p 1

[Article by Vitaliy Sinenko under "What People Are Talking About" rubric: "Who Will Support PRAVDA?"]

[Text] The topic of subscriptions has perhaps never before been so keenly debated or roused such interest, both at meetings with readers and in the editor's mailbag. What publication should be given preference? You think about this long and hard, especially if you have a pension of 105 rubles [R] a month for you and your wife, like A. Bulgakov from Lipetsk. Writer of a letter to the paper, he is a long-time reader of PRAVDA; he has been subscribing to it since 1928. The increase in the paper's subscription price renders him unable to do so. Hundreds of similar letters have come from veterans and worse-off people. And we sincerely understand people's sense of grief and annoyance. After ail, we too are subscribers, in our apartments too our favorite publications receive the rights of a close and faithful friend, with whom you argue and quarrel from time to time, but whom you value nonetheless. To lose a friend after more than 60 years of devotion, of shared joys and sorrows—what could be more painful...

A number of party organizations—in the Tashkent Relay and Automation Plant, the Ryazan Large Panel Prefabricated Housing Planning and Construction Association, the Moscow "Altair" science and production association, Alma-Ata Housing Construction Combine design and construction association, the Vichuga Spinning and Weaving Mill, and many others have approached us and the CPSU Central Committee with proposals, and even demands that we keep the cost of PRAVDA subscriptions at the old level and find the means to subsidize the newspaper out of the party budget. Communists are worried that the fall in the circulations of party publications could bring in its wake a weakening of the CPSU's influence in society and curtail the processes of democracy and glasnost in the country. For example, members of the Tsentralno-Gorodskoy Ukrainian Communist Party Raykom [rayon committee] write: "Today, just as the newspaper ISKRA once did, PRAVDA must promote the ideological unity of communists and the coordination of the forces of all sociopolitical organizations and currents whose interests coincide with the interests of the working people."

It is not for us to decide the question of centralized subsidies for the paper. The PRAVDA staff are grateful to readers for their understanding of the situation and their sincere concern, and hope that in the given collectives we will receive support not just in word but in deed. So far this support is far from being universal. A long-time friend of mine, secretary of a party committee in a large enterprise in Moscow, distressed that the subscription campaign for party publications is going badly, remarked sorrowfully: "And I am powerless. Now the subscriber has freedom of choice. I cannot agitate..."

Yes, the time has passed when there were orderly, controlled lines to subscribe to party publications. But I do not understand why a note of hopelessness should appear in both the words and the voice of a party leader, who is, incidentally, prestigious and respected by his collective. Who forbade him to agitate for his own press? There are all sorts of different publications nowadays. In a recent newspaper interview A. Gorkovluk, deputy chairman of the USSR State Committee for the Press, noted that since the date that the Law on the Press came into force 770 registration applications have been received, of which 444 were from new publications. More than 430 have already been registered. These include IZVESTIYA and GOLOS KURDA, KURANTY and TURMA I VOLYA, BALDA... Truly there are publications to meet every taste. And this is splendid. What is so good about 20 million people slaking their thirst for information from a single source? Now you can drink from any "river" or "stream." Naturally, each publication strives not to end up in the backwaters of the seething news market. At the same time, some publications are not choosy about means, and, as we have satisfied ourselves more than once, do

not let slip a chance to throw mud at PRAVDA. And the motive here is not always political. Commerce, competition—the words have come back to life.

But we know and believe that PRAVDA had, and has still, many true friends and defenders. Indeed, in these difficult days for the party not all CPSU members have rushed, whether from the call of the heart or for personal profit, to hand in their party cards and wash their hands of their newspaper. "I have been reading PRAVDA since my schooldays, although there were no communists in my family," Vasiliy Nikolayenko writes us from the city of Lyubertsy. "It is not stridency but the calm, considered tone of newspaper pronouncements today that will enable us to interpret the country's history and current events more correctly, to understand all the contradiction of intraparty life. And only a political blind man or a fervent anticommunist feels hatred for PRAVDA and seeks to denigrate it by any means. There are publications which try to foist on you the idea that the party's main paper has deteriorated. We, the subscribers, are well aware of this attack. Party organizations must, and will, support their publication. It would be an extremely bad mistake to pull PRAVDA down to the level of an ordinary newspaper."

However, it must be said that the initial results of the subscription do not give us cause for joy. The tempo is drastically behind last year's. But here is a telegram from Tajikistan: "The labor collective council of Anzob Mining and Enrichment Combine, bearing in mind the industrial and sociopolitical activity of communists, has decided at its routine session, for the purpose of material stimulation, to take out a subscription to the PRAVDA newspaper for all communists, to be paid for from the combine's social, cultural and consumer funds. Party Committee Secretary Safarov."

Combat veteran Pavel Sergeyevich Kovriga is not one of the most well-off residents of Ulyanovsk Oblast. His pension amounts to R110. "What do I want to say about PRAVDA? I would subscribe to it however much it cost!" Further on in his letter the veteran adduces arithmetical calculations which show that the annual savings on membership dues in connection with changes in the statutory norms will more than cover the increased price of the newspaper. And for their part, communists in Makeyevka City's Tsentralno-Gorodskoy party raykom called on all primary party organizations to use 50 percent of their residual membership dues to pay for PRAVDA subscriptions for all disadvantaged party veterans and war and labor invalids.

Today every subscriber is important to us, every citizen who votes with a ruble for the paper.

The subscription campaign is still continuing....

Frolov Meets With Journalists and Readers

PM2110133590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Oct 90 Second Edition p 5

[Report by T. Genrikhova: "Meeting With Readers. We Will Create the Newspaper Together"]

[Text] The intense passion and emotion characteristic of today's political debates and our everyday life were bound to affect the 18 October meeting between readers and I.T. Frolov, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and PRAVDA chief editor, the newspaper's writers, and editorial representatives. The meeting was held at the Moscow CPSU Gorkom [City Party Committee] and Moscow CPSU Obkom [Oblast Party Committee] Sociopolitical Center.

The people who came along for the discussion—and the doors were open to all comers—wanted answers to the most "painful" and topical questions pertaining to the country's economic and political life.

However, we journalists noted that some of the audience wanted unequivocal answers and directives in the spirit of former times when dissent was not permitted and party documents were only designed to be studied rather than analyzed, much less criticized.

Answering numerous questions, PRAVDA Chief Editor Frolov noted that the time for instructions and a patronizing tone is past. The newspaper is opening and will open its doors to highly varied opinions and judgments voiced by Communists and nonparty people, since that is the only way to achieve the civic accord which society so needs today. It will at the same time clearly pursue the party line.

Particular interest was manifested in the problems of our economy's transition to a market system of regulation. How can working people's social security be ensured in the new conditions? How does a market economy "square" with a socialist economy? These and similar questions provoked lively polemics.

The meeting stressed once again that the market is something that must be regarded in the context of our country's socialist choice.

I.A. Antonovich, member of the Politburo and secretary of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Communist Party Central Committee; V.V. Ryabov, CPSU Central Committee member and deputy head of the CPSU Central Committee Ideological Department; V.S. Lipitskiy, RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee member; and others took part in the discussion.

IZVESTIYA Deputy Forecasts Paper's Trends

LD2210113790 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0500 GMT 22 Oct 90

[Interview with Igor Golembiovskiy, first deputy editor in chief of IZVESTIYA, by unidentified correspondent on "what IZVESTIYA will be like in 1991"; date and place not given—recorded]

[Text] [Golembiovskiy] The common principles are to increase operational information; to increase the volume of political commentary; and to preserve, what seems to me to be a good tradition at IZVESTIYA, a series of analytical materials.

[Correspondent] Tell us please, is the competition being felt yet with the appearance of new publications, since freedom has appeared in the press?

[Golembiovskiy] It may be strange, but the press always has felt competition, even during the most stagnant times, since subscriptions were the only indicator of free choice, and there has always been a struggle. But, now, of course, it is more acute.

Our data and the data of our publishers in the localities suggest the growth of subscriptions with respect to October is proceeding two or three time more intensively.

ZVEZDA Editor Outlines Publishing Plans

LD1810085890 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 16 Oct 90

[Interview with G.F. Nikolayev, editor in chief of ZVEZDA, by V. Batalov, in ZVEZDA office; from the "Vremya' newscast—recorded]

[Text] [Batalov] Could you tell us, please, isn't the journal changing its image as a consequence of the drive for subscribers? Isn't it letting down its regular readers—let's put it like that—for the sake of attracting as many people as possible?

[Nikolayev] The journal has been in existence since 1924. It has endured repressions, it has endured the blockade. It continued to live after 1946, that year of sad memory, when Zhdanov tried to close down the journal. And I hope that the journal will surive today, too.

[Batalov] What works will subscribers find in your journal next year?

[Nikolayev] We will continue to publish Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn. With his permission we will print the fourth volume, the concluding volume, of his novel "March, 1917." For the first time in the Soviet Union we will print a series of interviews given by Academician Sakharov to foreign correspondents. I think that it wil be interesting to read Vaclav Havel's book "Dalkovy Vyslech" [Questioning at a Distance] about the defeat of the Prague spring. We will finish the book by Anton Vovseyenko about Beriya entitled: "The Career of an Executioner." We are thinking about making up a family library, and in particular we have for this library a book by Vanga, a Bulgarian woman journalist, and we have a book by the British doctor Justice Glass: "Live Until You're 180." That's briefly what I wanted to say.

News Conference on Newspapers' Registration

PM1910131690 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 18 Oct 90 Second Edition p 4

[Report by G. Orekhanova: "Writers Favor Unity"]

[Text] "Consolidation or confrontation"—that was the slogan covering the discussion at a USSR Writers Union press conference of the problems caused by the situation that has taken shape today in the country's literary sphere.

The following event was the direct reason for the press conference at the USSR Writers Union—the USSR Writers Union working secretariat headed by V.V. Karpov submitted an application to the Moscow City Court for the journal ZNAMYA, believing the labor collective's registration as the founder of the journal to be illegal since it is in breach of Article 13 of the Law on the Press.

In this connection a discussion also developed at the press conference around the status of LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, which, like ZNAMYA, was registered by the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Ministry of the Press and Mass Information as a newspaper founded by the LITERATURNAYA GAZETA editorial office labor collective. In the opinion of V.V. Karpov, this kind of registration deprives the 10,000-strong army of writers—members of the USSR Writers Union—of the opportunity to control the financial capital which LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, as the USSR Writers Union organ, assigned for writers' needs in the past. V.V. Karpov cited NOVYY MIR, of which the USSR Literary Foundation is cofounder on an equal footing with the journal's labor collective, as a positive example of the registration of a literary publication.

Speeches by V. Oleynik, L. Vasilyeva, Al. Mikhaylov, I. Shklyarevskiy, and A. Pristavkin appealed to the intelligentsia to rally their ranks. As for the conflicts over ZNAMYA and LITERATURNAYA GAZETA the USSR Writers Union leadership suggests that the leadership of these publications decline their current registration and the ZNAMYA and LITERATURNAYA GAZETA labor collectives act as cofounders with the USSR Writers Union or the USSR Literary Foundation.

New Aryan Magazine Established

PM1510113290 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No. 40, 14-21 Oct 90 p 11

[V. Khlebchik report: "New Aryan Magazine 'KROM'"]

[Text] Olga Annushkina is an electronic specialist by education, but intends to publish the Aryan magazine KROM. In her application, she wrote that the magazine intends to preserve and restore the cultural and historical heritage of the Aryan civilization. This somewhat bewilders Goskomizdat (the State Publishing Committee) which is trying to find out from authoritative historians what such a civilization is. Olga Annushkina, of course, knows less than an expert in this field about the ancestors of the all Indo-European-Aryan tribes, which during various periods had conquered and assimilated many nations—from contemporary India to France. But this will not keep her from publishing the magazine, in which specialists will reveal their latest finds about the who, when and wheres of Aryan history

"Why Aryans? It so happens," explained Olga, "that I graduated from a forestry institute, then for four years worked at a closed establishment. I got bored at the latter and fled electronics at the first possible chance. I became acquainted with several researchers who are studying Aryan problems—and the magazine was born."

The majority of us knows nothing about the Aryan race: due to its special role in Nazi ideology, nothing was written about it in our country, and such research works were not encouraged. That's why, according to Annushkina, there are more than enough material for the magazine, and the first issue has already been set and fed into the computer.

The magazine receives funding, paper and connections from an independent association of electronic workers with the same name Krom. In Ancient Russian this meant "castle" or "fortress".

"We didn't pass to the name any sort of a special sense," says Annushkina. "Simply, for a long time we couldn't find a name that would not be repeated anywhere and would pass for a name. We found KROM."

In the foreseeable future the magazine won't bring any profit to the publishers. For these electronic workers the history of the Aryan culture is just a hobby, to which they can give part of their already sizeable incomes. The magazine will be published once every two months and will be half the size of the magazine NOVYY MIR. The manager, she is also the editor-in-chief, does not think about competition: what competition can there be without profit? The magazine will have its own, quite narrow and specific audience, which is interested in knowing what influence the Aryan culture had on the cultures, life styles and the genofund of the Indo-European nations.

The KROM association printshop has enough paper for 15,000 copies of the first issue. We can only hope that authoritative historians and the State Committee for Publishing won't find in Aryan problems anything that contradicts the new Law on the Press.

New Weekly To Prepare People for Market Economy

PM1810081090 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Oct 90 Second Edition p 3

[Report by editorial board of the newspaper USPEKH under the rubric "Ticker Tape": "USPEKH Awaits You"]

[Text] Will the transition to the market mean a drop into an abyss or a leap into abundance? It is possible to hear categorically different replies to this question in society today. But life will evidently give a third and not at all direct—"yes" or "no"—answer. It is necessary to prepare for market relations. And not only ministries and enterprises must do so. Every person and every family must do so. It may be necessary to seek additional sources of earnings in order to stop poverty from biting, and some people will want to develop their own thing. It is here that USPEKH [success] could act as a guide. The new weekly commercial newspaper will help people to prepare even just morally for the imminent changes. Its first issue has been published. USPEKH's founders are the newspaper PRAVDA and the Capital Reports Agency.

The editorial board thanks the "Soyuzpechat" organs which have undertaken to distribute the publication, which is new to a broad readership.

KROKODIL Magazine Editor Interviewed

LD2010190590 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 20 Oct 90

[Interview with A. Pyankov, editor in chief of satirical magazine KROKODIL, by correspondent Mironova under the rubric "Newspapers and Magazines 1991"; from the "Vremya" newscast—recorded]

[Excerpts] [Mironova] Your magazine is dear, so you will have to appeal not only to readers' sense of humor but to their pockets, too. We are not offering a platform to all, so now it is up to you to defend yourself.

[Pyankov] Of course our magazine is dear. But I believe it is not only dear in price; it is also dear to our readers, if you see what I mean.

[Mironova] Not a bad pun for a start.

[Pyankov] So our magazine might be dear, but all the same we should like somehow to justify these price rises. So, along with the Ministry of Health we set up what we call a KROKODIL initiative—here in front of me is one of the issue—and we are very pleased that the West German firm Bayer gave us medicines to the value of 3 million marks free of charge.

[Mironova] and what did you do with them?

[Pyankov] We ensured that they went to those people who desperately needed them.

[Mironova] Look, I'm sorry, but we still haven't finished with the main point, which is how dear your magazine is.

[Pyankov] Yes, but we would like each of our issues to start with a vivid, punchy, telling, political cartoon. Because our life today—it is almost a truism to say it—has become politicized in the extreme. So if the magazine does not fit this politicized context, very few people will be interested in it. On the other hand, if it is excessively politicized it will also lose any... [passage omitted]

[Mironova] I fear that, fearless as we may be, we seem to be talking more about the government than about specific instances of bureaucracy hindering our lives at the personal level.

[Pyankov] I fear you may be right. Because people are not afraid now to criticize the government. Incidentally, in the twenties KROKODIL took a very light-hearted approach to all these things. That was very helpful. Even so, I think what was said then, to the effect that he who is not afraid to laugh is not afraid of anything—I believe that premise will never lose its force.

PEOPLE'S DEPUTY Editor Interviewed

LD2110172490 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0705 GMT 21 Oct 90

[Excerpts] [Announcer] The subscription campaign is coming to an end, but I think, or to be more precise, I hope that the subscription deadline of 1 November will be extended. Many editors have spoken on this radio station, have presented their publications, and have spoken about their authors and plans for 1991. Yesterday, Mikhail Ivanovich Piskotin visited us. He is a doctor of legal science and chief editor of the journal THE PEOPLE'S DEPUTY. [passage omitted] Do you have information about how the subscription campaign is going at the moment?

[Piskotin] The subscription campaign is evidently proving quite difficult at the moment, if not for all then at least for very many journals. The very first news was discouraging. Subscriptions on the 10th of this month were approximately 7-8 percent compared to the subscriptions of last year. Yet the latest news is encouraging. In some oblasts, subcriptions—as it appears—have risen to approximately 30 percent. [passage omitted]

[Announcer] One more question: How often does your journal come out?

[Piskotin] Our journal comes out 18 times a year. By the way, the subscription price is 10 rubles and 80 kopecks. The subscription price has risen, as it has on all publications, but not considerably. The subscription price has only doubled; before a subscription cost five roubles and 40 kopecks. [passage omitted]

DIALOG Magazine Editor Interviewed

LD2110182990

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1530 GMT on 21 October, in the "Newspapers and Magazines 1991" section of the "Vremya" newscast, carries a three-minute interview with V.D. Popov, doctor of philosophical sciences and editor in chief of the magazine DIALOG, by correspondent O. Ivanova. The video shows Popov and Ivanova seated in an office; various pages of DIALOG are also shown in close-up.

Popov states: "A dialogue, after all, presupposes the attainment of some kind of accord, some kind of truth, some kind of consensus, in the name of something sacred. And when there are few sacred things in society, then it is very difficult to hold a dialogue. The most difficult thing today is to win the trust of the readers."

Ivanova says: "You are always talking about the trust of the readers. So you have to publish such materials of interest to a broad range of readers. Yet, after all, you are a body of the party Central Committee, and therefore you already have to speak of some things from a definite point of view, from definite positions."

Popov replies: "For me, party membership is, first of all, humanity. Why is religion winning today and why is communist ideology losing? Because religion is addressed to the soul of man; while an ideology that is not addressed to the soul of man, to the soul of the populace, has no prospects. Therefore, today in DIALOG we have a whole section called "Man" [Chelovek]. Well, it is namely around the sore points that we want to hold a dialogue with public opinion. But how far we manage to do that is another question.

"Let's take, for instance, the most topical problem, that of the market. Today we are holding a dialogue with the market. Well, let's say we are fulfilling an educational function, in my opinion, a noble one." It must be a market of the people, and we are trying to find the truth and to reveal it to people so that people are not afraid. After all, the tragedy today lies in what? In the fact that we are creating a market for the people, in the name of the populace, and it does not understand what that is."

Everybody has been frightened by the market, on economics. I would say that articles of a political character, about parties, are in second place," Popov says. "If we speak of, well, the highest aims, of the most humane aims, then we are holding a dialogue in the name of civil peace, in the name of civil accord. We even want to make next year the magazine's year of civil accord, because without that no market will be possible, and no economy will withstand our worsening strife," Popov says in conclusion.

EKHO PLANETY Chief Interviewed

LD2210105890 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0930 GMT 22 Oct 90

[Interview with N.K. Setunskiy, editor in chief of EKHO PLANETY, by correspondent L. Kushnarenko; place and date not given; from the "Vremya" newscast—live or recorded]

[Text] [Kushnarenko] Until recently, TASS, one of the biggest news agencies in the world, had no publication of its own. But now we are already becoming accustomed to the journal EKHO PLANETY. Probably the readers alone know that this weekly is put together by the enormous TASS collective.

[Setunskiy] We have correspondents accredited in 110 countries of the world. For our subscribers we might also add that next year we will be publishing material from parts of the planet from which Soviet correspondents have never filed before, above all, from South Korea, Israel—where TASS will have an office—and South Africa, where we will also have correspondents based. And naturally we hope that this will be of interest to the readers.

In addition, it is a kind of family publication, a publication for all the family, in which everyone can find something interesting to do with all sorts of problems on the lives of people and the planet. In other words, those who are concerned about regional conflicts will, of course, receive information on what's happening in the world's flashpoints—Lebanon, India, Sri Lanka, and so on. We will find out how foreign countries combat the problem of burglary, how they keep drinking water and the city air clean. So, we would also like to stress now that apart from Soviet contributors and correspondents we bring in a large number of foreign writers to our pages. Our readers will learn from an American stewardess about working conditions in that profession in the United States and a former American policeman writes in the journal. Our contributors are often trainees in TASS offices abroad.

We have a whole range of interesting ideas. We plan to bring out a supplement. We have already obtained and (?shall present) several interesting foreign detective stories never before published in our country. We hope that the journal will meet your expectations.

[Kushnarenko] Particularly since the nature of TASS is partially retained, I mean the speed with which information is obtained.

[Setunskiy] Definitely. TASS...[changes thought] our journal is a weekly and with the help of electronic communications we are able to publish reports on events that occur literally 24 or 48 hours before going to press.

Ministry Registers THE REPORTER Newspaper

LD2210092990 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0700 GMT 22 Oct 90

[Text] The Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Ministry of the Press and Mass Media registered THE REPORTER, a new newspaper founded by the International Journalists Center.

THE REPORTER will help consolidate the efforts of journalists in the struggle to create a free and independent press and defend their professional interests.

Paper Publishes First Issue Since 1917

LD1610191490

[Editorial Report] Moscow World Service in English at 1410 GMT on 16 October carries a report on the "relaunch" of MOSKOVSKIYE VEDOMOSTI newspaper, which first appeared in 1756 and published its final issue on 8 November 1917.

The report says the newspaper "is now back on the news stands, having been revitalized by a group of young men led by Leonid Krasniy," once a regular contributor of "satirical stories" to MOSKOVSKIY KOMSOMOLETS.

The report says the founders' declaration notes that the newspaper "will have the status of a public, commercial, informative, illustrated, politically independent publication". The founders "would like it to care for the well-being of the city rather than of various public or government organizations."

The newspaper is headquartered in "two rooms" at Kniga Publishers, the report adds. Today's edition "comprises 16 pages. The paper carries advertisements, some of which are published free of charge for those with low incomes," the report says.

The announcer describes the newspaper as "extremely good...a treat to hold." Subscriptions are free and may be obtained directly from the editorial office.

Chief Editor on New Journal SLOVO

LD1810181190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 18 Oct 90

[Interview with A.V. Larionov, editor in chief of SLOVO, by Ninel Shakhova; from the "Vremya" newscast—live or recorded]

[Excerpt] [Shakhova] Arseniy Vasilieyevich, you—with the help of your readers—have already determined the new character of your journal, which is now called SLOVO [The Word], and it is to be a guidebook to the huge book world. It would be hard to overestimate the signifiacne of this journal. What are you filling it with in 1991?

[Larionov] Well, I would like to start the story with the first edition. Strictly speaking, the first issue demonstrates the character of the year. And we are opening it with the prayer of the (?opta) elders. Perhaps this is somewhat unexpected, but this prayer is addressed to every person who is beginning the day. Our readers probably know the large Hessen series which was published in 22 volumes in Berlin. But, unfortunately, it has not yet been published in our country. There is much work to be done and it is unlikely that we will receive it soon. But, the journal has the opportunity of acquainting people with this archive and in the first edition we have Prishvin and Baroness Vrangel's letter addressed to the future generation of Russians. And here we are beginning a new, very interesting series on the civil war, but from the side of the Whites, the heroes of White Russia. We would like to combine, on the one hand, the past, the forgotten field, and at the same time a tense sense of the present day. [passage omitted]

New Women's Newspaper for Charitable Purposes

LD1910205390 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 17 Oct 90

[Text] Yuzhno-Sakhalinsk—The oblast organization of the USSR Journalists' Union and a small enterprise, Germes, started to publish the first newspaper in the Far East for women, which was named LADA. Unlike other commercial publications, LADA will devote all profits to charitable purposes. The purchase of imported equipment for the local maternity hospital and medical advice center will become the first project of this kind. Those living below the poverty line and inmates of children's homes will be given special attention by LADA journalists.

Leaders Sign Academy Adviser's Obituary

PM2210153190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Oct 90 Second Edition p 8

[Obituary of Academician Petr Nikolayevich Fedoseyev]

[Excerpts] Academician Petr Nikolayevich Fedoseyev, well-known Soviet philosopher and adviser to the USSR Academy of Sciences Presidium, has died at the age of 82. [passage omitted]

[Signed] M.S. Gorbachev, V.G. Afanasyev, N.B. Binkenin, D.M. Gvishiani, A.Ya. Degtyarev, A.S. Dzasokhov, A.G. Yegorov, V.A. Ivashko, A.S. Kapto, F.V. Konstantinov, V.N. Kudryavtsev, V.V. Laptev, I.M. Makarov, G.I. Marchuk, V.A. Medvedev, T.I. Oyzerman, Yu.A. Osipyan, Ye.M. Primakov, Yu.A. Prokofyev, G.L. Smirnov, V.S. Stepin, I.T. Frolov. A.M. Yakovlev.

Economic

Aganbegyan Interviewed on Market Economy

PM2410105190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 Oct 90 Union Edition p 2

[Interview with Academician A. Aganbegyan by V. Romanyuk; place and date not given: "Academician A. Aganbegyan: There Will be Changes as Early as Next Spring"]

[Text] [Romanyuk] Abel Gezevich, what sacrifices will have to made for the transition to the market? Are there any guarantees that hopes will not be in vain, as has already happened repeatedly in the past?

[Aganbegyan] I do not like the formulation of this question—talking about sacrifices. After all, we are switching to a market economy not for the sake of someone's academic ambitions or on the whim of the country's leadership. Everything is being done for people's sake. All you have to do is look at countries with developed markets, and you will realize: Life is better with the market than without it. Regarding sacrifices, let me repeat: We are making them today, and doing so on a much greater scale than in market conditions. There is nothing pleasant in the fact that you have no choice of goods in the stores, lack an opportunity to improve your housing conditions by paying for it with your own money, and have no prospects of an early acquisition of a car. And there is nothing you can do about it! The market will eliminate all these problems.

[Romanyuk] All we have to do is find the money for all this....

[Aganbegyan] Work for it! The market will give you an opportunity to earn, and then to spend the money to some advantage. Over the last three years wages in the country have increased on average by a factor of 1.5, but our life has become worse instead of better. This is because scarce goods have to be bought from speculators at sky-high prices. Normalization of the consumer market is one of the key tasks we have to resolve immediately.

[Romanyuk] When will it occur, this normalization?

[Aganbegyan] I assume that striking changes will occur as early as next spring. Provided, of course, that everything goes according to plan. There are three factors for the consumer market's stabilization. First of all, the population's money incomes. This year's incomes growth will be 15 percent, and growth at least as high is expected in 1991. The problem is not the incomes themselves but the fact that they are significantly in excess of available goods. It is necessary to find a different but equally advantageous application for surplus money.

[Romanyuk] But what?

[Aganbegyan] The population is now spending 78 percent of earned money on goods and services. It is necessary to change the course of the flow of money. We have virtually no housing market, nor has there been any development of medical and pension insurance services. And why not launch interest-free loans for the acquisition of scarce goods under firm state guarantees? We pay really beggarly interest on the population's savings bank deposits. Finally, we buy very little on credit, whereas this is one of the most widespread forms of payment in the world. If all the aforementioned money flows were to be released, I am confident that the commodity market would be released from the grip of speculators and "shadow dealers" and prices will drop.

[Romanyuk] Therefore, all we have to do is wait until spring 1991?

[Aganbegyan] I would divide the process of transition to the market in two stages: The revolutionary one (1.5-2 years), when the administrative command system will be replaced by a market economy system while retaining state regulation, and the evolutionary one (10-15 years), when there will be a perestroyka of economic ties, the entire economy's structure will be changed in line with the market's demands, and—and this will be the most complex aspect—people's mentality will undergo perestroyka. These are the immediate prospects: To establish a consumer market by the end of 1991 and supply it with goods (if only at 1986 levels) and, by approximately the same time, to launch a money and securities market; the 1992 task is to shape a market for the means of production and a labor market. Each one of these tasks is complex and large in itself. For example, the creation of the labor market must be preceded by measures like elimination of the barriers now created by residence permits, revival of the housing market, creation of new jobs, and so on. Ultimately, the market is both an instrument for the country's socioeconomic reconstruction and the actual process of this reconstruction.

[Romanyuk] The following appraisal of the document was encountered in the press: A. Aganbegyan's compromise option is nothing but a polished version of the draft by S. Shatalin's group interspersed with bits from the government program. What do you perceive as fundamentally new in this option?

[Aganbegyan] Let us be specific: This is the presidential program. M.S. Gorbachev personally worked intensely on it. The fundamentally new aspect is the fact that we are adopting not some sort of specific program with rigidly set parameters, but a set of basic guidelines "cleansed" of numerous details which, as a rule, tend to become the topic of debate between republics. This gives a completely new orientation to the entire strategy. After all, we ourselves are changing: We are transforming ourselves from a unitary state into a union of sovereign republics.

The basic guidelines represent a deliberate choice, stemming also from the new and enhanced rights of republics and autonomous formations. This is probably the first document banking not on diktat but on union: Each republic will be given an opportunity to implement its own program, coordinating its action with the other republics and operating within the framework of an all-Union market, a common economic space.

[Romanyuk] What has been elevated to Union level?

[Aganbegyan] Out of all the general economic problems, what will be primarily resolved at Union level in coordination with the republics will be questions of financial, credit, currency, and customs policy; in other words everything that goes to make the skeleton of the all-Union market. The center will also play a great role in determining the mechanism of citizens' social rights and guarantees. The basic guidelines leave to the Union the really basic concepts and questions which are the exclusive prerogative of Union organs. The document runs to 66 pages, it can at least be read through. Let me remind readers: L. Erhard's and L. Balcerowicz's famous programs ran to just a few pages of text.

[Romanyuk] Many people are scared by the market's unpredictability regarding employment and the possibility of prices rocketing. The country already has some 2-2.5 million unemployed today, and their number could multiply in a market economy. How will they live? Everyone wants reliable protection against the negative consequences of the introduction of market mechanisms.

[Aganbegyan] This is not a problem for central authorities alone. In addition to the state programs, local organs of power must tackle the creation of new jobs and the retraining of cadres. Stabilization funds will be set up to support many weak enterprises, to prevent them from closing down and help them take the path of efficient economic management. Subsidies will be introduced for temporary loss of work. But our country badly needs new jobs, especially in the services sphere, and we should not wait for mass unemployment. And in order to prevent any drop of the real living standards of the least protected population strata, it is envisaged to retain fixed state prices for prime necessities, together with compensation payments and indexation of incomes linked to price rises. The consumer selection of goods (consumer "baskets") will be regularly published and will be used to monitor the dynamism of prices for prime necessities. It cannot be ruled out that, following a decision by republican and local organs, some regions and cities might temporarily introduce rationed distribution of basic goods.

The range of goods offered must also be expanded by redistribution of resources in favor of Group "B" and by the introduction of powerful incentives there. The import of consumer goods will also be sharply expanded. As for retail prices, there will be a gradual transition from state prices to market prices (supply-and-demand prices which maintain market equilibrium) starting, of

course, with non-prime necessities. There will be no universal rise of retail prices as of a certain date.

[Romanyuk] Many a lance has been broken over the 500 days program. The polemics surfaced even at the Union legislature's rostrum. The following claim was made: The government program is already being implemented, while the program by S. Shatalin's group is being blocked by the center.

[Aganbegyan] I personally support the 500 days program, and have openly said so on many occasions. But today's situation is different from that in August, when this program was elaborated, and the logic of the past is not quite suitable for the current situation. Financial recovery measures have to be implemented in conditions of growing inflation and galloping price increases. In any case, the paramount task is to do everything possible to control price rises—this process can no longer be halted altogether. At the same time, measures for the national economy's financial recovery will be implemented with greater urgency, as envisaged by both the 500 days program and the government program, together with supplementary measures to deal with the aggravated conditions.

The budget is another disputed question. S. Shatalin's program envisaged a fully balanced budget as early as the last quarter of 1990 and a non-deficit budget in 1991. But this is impossible to achieve. The deficit will evidently reach 20 billion in the last quarter, and it is well known that plans for 1991 envisage that it be held down to 25-30 billion (2.5-3 percent of gross national product). But these are projections which will prove exceptionally complex to meet. Moreover, whereas our budget deficit was formerly covered by bank credits and emission of money, this time we are committed to avoiding such flawed steps.

[Romanyuk] So, what if events fail to develop as envisaged in the basic guidelines?

[Aganbegyan] A lot will probably "go wrong." We must, in all such cases, have a reserve package of measures to be promptly brought into operation. For example, suppose our budget deficit deteriorates and we are facing the threat of emission. Should this occur, it might be possible to ban the cash sale of goods costing more than 500 rubles, allowing only payments by check. Other measures are also possible.

[Romanyuk] Proposals to switch to presidential rule have been recently voiced, following the sharper criticism of the Union government. What do you think about this?

[Aganbegyan] The USSR Council of Ministers will be retained, at least until the Union treaty is concluded, when the question of the form of government in the USSR may be raised constitutionally. At the same time, serious changes are planned for the structure of the national economy's management, including personnel changes. The role played by some organs—like the USSR Ministry of Finance and the USSR Gosbank [State Bank] for example—must be enhanced, while that played by others—say the USSR Gosplan [State Planning Committee] and the USSR Gossnab [State Committee for Material and Technical Supply]—must be fundamentally changed. There is a draft plan for the Gosplan's reorganization. I personally will regret this: Organs like the Gosplan exist in France, Japan, and South Korea. As a matter of fact, new organs making up the structures of presidential rule are being actively created today. A key role will be played by the Interrepublic Economic Committee—it will function under the Council of the Federation.

[Romanyuk] Abel Gezevich, you are familiar with the reforms in Argentina, Brazil, and Poland. Where do we fit against this background?

[Aganbegyan] Nowhere. They have implemented their reforms, whereas we have only declared our intentions. We have not accumulated any practical experience and, alas, we lack wisdom. Moreover, the institutions of state power are falling apart. I think that our legislators are not fully aware of their responsibility, either. Otherwise neither the 1990 budget with its 60-billion deficit nor many other decisions would have been adopted. Legislators in civilized countries operate with a greater measure of responsibility. The latest incident in the U.S. Congress is indicative: The legislators disagree with the budget expenditures proposed by the U.S. President. And yet their budget deficit represents only a minor proportion of gross national product (3.6 percent) and is fully covered by the issue of securities.

[Romanyuk] In your view, what factors will determine success in the implementation of the program for transition to the market?

[Aganbegyan] In the first place, we need political stability and accord between the center and the republics.

[Romanyuk] Many people were confused by the two presidential decrees which preceded the program's adoption. Many economists think that they are antimarket. They even contradict one another: On the one hand we are "freezing" economic ties and forcibly attaching consumers to suppliers, while on the other hand we are introducing contract prices and thus reinforcing the former's diktat over the latter.

[Aganbegyan] The president acted in line with both the 500 days program and the government program—these stabilization measures were envisaged in both. But this is what public opinion feels: If presented by the 500 days program, the public thinks that these measures will lead to stabilization and financial recovery; if they stem from the government, they will apparently "undermine" the market and produce a fresh round of inflation.

[Romanyuk] What happens next?

[Aganbegyan] Next, I think, presidential decrees will be used to eliminate, one after the other, the barriers

holding back the market economy's development. As for contradictions, I do not think that they constitute a major drama. Are there not enough contradictions in life itself? Are there no contradictions between the 500 days program approved by Russia's parliament and the decisions subsequently made by that selfsame parliament?

Today it is exceptionally important not to focus attention on contradictions but to seek ways leading to accord, to overcome the "paralysis of power" at Union level, and finally to create efficient organizational structures in the center, capable of collaborating with the republics and making decisions in the most democratic way possible.

[Romanyuk] What is your attitude toward the idea of decisions by Union organs being ratified by the republics?

[Aganbegyan] As far as calls for the ratification of presidential decrees by the republics are concerned, I assume that these are nothing but political slogans whose implementation can lead only to chaos, the economy's collapse, and inaction by management organs. If we trust the physician who is about to treat us, then let us give him an opportunity to make his own choice of treatment for saving the patient, without questioning each step he takes.

Rail Minister Urges Workers To Oppose Strikes

914H0009A Moscow GUDOK in Russian 7 Oct 90 p 1

[Statement by Minister of Railways N. Konarev: "The MPS Collegium Is Against Strikes"]

[Text] On 20 September 1990, the 25th Congress of the Independent Trade Union of Railway Workers and Construction Personnel of Transportation addressed a declaration to the USSR Council of Ministers in which it raised, in the form of an ultimatum, the issue of abolishing the disciplinary statute for railway workers and of granting the railway workers the right to strike. The congress adopted a resolution to the effect that, if the USSR Supreme Soviet and the USSR Council of Ministers fail to comply with the congress declaration before 14 October of this year, the trade union Central Committee is instructed to hold a warning strike lasting 30 minutes on 15 October at 1400 hours, and if the demands are not met after the warning strike, to call a general strike of railway transportation at 1400 hours on 25 October until the demands are fully met.

At its meeting on 24 September, the USSR Ministry of Railways [MPS] Collegium reviewed the above decisions of the trade union congress and noted that they are unlawful, are aimed at destabilizing the operation of railway transportation in our country, and are capable of bringing about unpredictable and disastrous consequences in the economic and political life of our society.

The resolutions of the congress run counter to the USSR Law "On Procedures for Settling Collective Labor Disputes (Conflicts)" in effect, as it applies to the prohibition of strikes at the enterprises and in the organizations of railway transportation. They will bring about anarchy and irresponsibility in railway transportation.

The disciplinary statute for the employees of USSR railway transportation reflects the peculiarities of operation and management of this most significant sector of the national economy, which meets the needs of the population, economy, and the defense capability of the country. At the same time, the collegium did not deny the need to revise some provisions of the statute taking into account modern requirements and legislative acts, but not to the detriment of labor discipline and the safety of train traffic.

Strikes violate the uniform technological regimen in the existing political and economic emergency situation, in the environment of preparations of the national economy for operations under winter conditions, and harvesting. Enterprises in our country and those in transportation will suffer great losses that will seriously affect the financial status and resolution of the social issues of railway employees in the country as a whole. The stoppage of railway transportation for one day brings about losses of R346 million for the railways alone, including R65 million in transportation profits, R11 million for failing to furnish cars for loading, R30 million for the late delivery of freight, and R240 million for the failure to deliver products to enterprises.

Total losses of the national economy and population of our country will exceed R3 billion. Hence the antistate nature of the action conceived by the authors of the above resolution of the trade union congress is fully understandable for all.

The collegium is aware that many problems have accumulated, and that they are serious. They may only be solved through persistent and painstaking work. We now need to appreciate and respect the working people, perfect the transportation process, and implement new economic and organizational methods of work. All of the financial resources at our disposal should be used to solve these problems.

The MPS has approached the president of the country, the USSR Supreme Soviet, and the USSR Council of Ministers with a request to speed up the consideration and adoption of the USSR Law on Railway Transportation, which sets forth its legal and economic foundations, the legal status of the enterprises and organizations of railway transportation, and makes provisions for the social protection of railway employees, as well as accelerating the adoption of a program of technical retooling and modernization of railways, to improve material-technical supply, and so on.

The collegium noted with satisfaction that over this entire period the railway collectives have built on glorious worthy traditions and have continuously displayed

their best qualities—camaraderie, mutual assistance, mutual understanding, and their lofty duty to the country and the Soviet people.

The ministry is convinced that during this complicated period the working people of the sector will display wisdom, civic maturity, tenacity, and recognition of their responsibility for the fate of the country, performing their duties faithfully. Maintain order and discipline. Do not allow yourselves to be drawn into conflicts that bring about pauses in train traffic.

I express my conviction that the working people of the steel main lines, displaying a high degree of responsibility and organization, will rebuff destructive forces, ensure stable work to meet the transportation needs of the national economy and the population, and will contribute to accomplishing the difficult tasks of perestroyka.

[Signed] Minister of Railways N. Konarev.

Rail Ministry Official Details Transport Losses

914H0010A Moscow GUDOK in Russian 7 Oct 90 p 2

[Article by V. Logunov, chief of the Ministry of Railways Main Administration of Container Transport and Commercial Work: "This Is How They Pilfer It"]

[Text] **In 1989, railways paid 19.6 rubles [R] million for their failure to deliver freight safely.**

In the six months of this year alone, the railways paid R16 million.

More than 44 percent of all losses in transportation are associated with theft.

In the first half of the year, losses and theft of foodstuffs, motor vehicle accessories, gasoline, consumer goods, and imported freight increased abruptly....

V. Logunov, chief of the Ministry of Railways Main Administration of Container Transport and Commercial Work, reflects on the causes of the increase in losses.

In 1980, the government adopted a special resolution "On Measures for Ensuring the Safety of Freight for the National Economy and Stepping Up the Fight Against Theft in Railway Transportation."

At that time, the situation was extremely bad. The system paid R58.8 million for losses in one year.

Particular attention was given to improving the technology of freight handling and commercial work, and to augmenting the material-technical facilities of transportation, especially freight-handling enterprises. In the four years of the current five-year plan alone, R450 million were invested to this end. Warehouses, elevated tracks, and so on were built. More than 200 container terminals were opened.

Technological changes have also occurred. At present, all freight handling and commercial work is concentrated at 56 loading and unloading sections. Progressive forms of labor organization are employed there.

Extensive use of automated systems began. At present, freight is located by computers.

Commercial inspection points have acquired TV equipment, electronic clearance gates, modern walkie-talkies, and new seals and latch devices. For example, the October Railroad successfully uses a new coded combination bolt-lock to lock rolling stock carrying valuable cargo from Finland, and the Kuybyshev Railroad uses it for delivering passenger cars on special double-decker cars.

The trials of an experimental batch of locking and sealing devices selected on the basis of the results of an all-Union competition have ended. At present, a pilot batch of such devices is being manufactured, and in the fourth quarter of this year, they will be furnished to the railroads for operational trials.

However, the technical aspect is no panacea in solving this important problem. Personnel, especially commercial specialists—the kind the new economic conditions call for, are an important element. A shortage of such specialists and a lag in their appropriate training is being acutely felt. The role and significance of such specialists will increase abruptly in the course of a transition to a market economy. However, the railroads do not appreciate this. Thus, at the Northern and Donetsk railroads, as well as a number of others, the number of such specialists is being reduced, or they are merged with other subdivisions that have nothing to do with the tasks the commercial personnel are called upon to accomplish. Such practices were denounced in an order by the minister of railways. A system of schooling and training specialists was set forth, as well as greater material incentives for them. We cooperate closely with law-enforcement organs.

All of this enabled us to reduce losses in a planned manner. By 1988, damage caused by the loss of freight amounted to R16.7 million.

However, the situation deteriorated last year and this year. It is particularly bad on the Transcaucasian, Central Asian, North Caucasus, October, Volga, Alma-Ata, Kuybyshev, South Urals, Azerbaijan, Far Eastern, Gorkiy, Moscow, Sverdlovsk, West Siberian, Lvov, Southwestern, and West Kazakhstan railroads. These railroads account for almost 80 percent of all losses on the system.

High rates of loss on the Transcaucasian, North Caucasus, and Azerbaijan railroads are due to some degree to the well-known events in this region. A tremendous number of trains abandoned at stages and at stations not designed for such purposes, as well as the transfer of freight to organizations other than specified in the bills of lading in order to avoid spoilage facilitated losses. To

this day, hundreds of cars with freight worth tens of millions of rubles have not been tracked, and the recipients have filed claims against the railroads.

Mass pilferage gives rise to particular concern. During the six months of this year, R7.1 million were paid to freight recipients on this account. The incidence of cases with the participation of railway personnel increased almost by a third. In the first quarter, law enforcement organs apprehended 1,807 transportation personnel. Employees of rolling-stock facilities predominate. The greatest numbers of those apprehended were registered on the October, Lvov, South Urals, and Southern Railroads. This is indicative of extremely poor work on cadre selection and assignment.

As a rule, theft occurs where the attitude toward complying with the technology of organizing train traffic, freight handling and commercial work, identification checks, and guarding the most valuable freight is irresponsible. For example, existing procedures call for leaving the trains, if necessary only, at locations specified by a relevant order of the railroad chief, and under mandatory guard. Reality turns out to be different. Last year, by order of a deputy chief of the North Caucasus Railroad, a train containing a car with tires was abandoned without a locomotive on a side track. There was no guard. As a result, these products worth R123,077 were stolen.

It appears to be clear that freight-handling areas should be fenced off, and identification checks and accurate work with waybills should be organized. However, we frequently encounter something different. Anybody who so wishes may roam the Moscow-Paveletskaya freight terminal. Hence cases of theft from cars are common.

Neglect for technological procedures and at times their deliberate violation become the root cause of theft. At the station of Shushary on the October Railroad, a car carrying tires was moved from one location to another for two months, until its cargo was stolen by the employees of a motor vehicle pool and a local mechanized section.

Crashes, accidents, and fires on trains inflict considerable losses. The organization of freight recovery leaves a lot to be desired. In the fall of last year, a wreck in which the rolling stock caught fire occurred on the Transcaucasian Railroad in the vicinity of the Tbilisi station. However, several cars burned up due to procrastination and lack of dispatch in putting out the fire. The recipient filed claims exceeding R12 million for four of the cars alone. On Guryev Division of the West Kazakhstan Railroad, a car carrying cotton worth R113,000 burned up.

Frequent cases of freight getting separated from documents also bring about losses. Thousands of cars without documents turn up daily due to the imperfect technology of operations of technical offices and the elementary lack of discipline on the part of employees.

The loss and theft of foodstuffs, automotive accessories, gasoline, consumer goods, imported and other freight have increased considerably. Foodstuffs worth R5.4 million were lost in half a year. Payments for the loss of imported freight amount to almost R3 million. This is four times more than last year.

In this case, the imperfection of packaging is the main reason. Many recipients of freight sign contracts for the delivery of products to our country in packaging that does not ensure safety and becomes unfit en route. Thus, pursuant to contracts with the All-Union Association Soyuzkhimeksport, between 165 and 210 packages of the washing detergents Dixan and Suna are placed on pallets and wrapped in foil without bands or tapes. Such packaging falls apart in route. Losses of detergents exceeded R10,000 in five months. Railroads adjacent to the border do not take advantage of the right given to them to refuse to accept such freight at the border and to ship it back.

Recently, the situation with the preservation of farm goods has deteriorated. Losses in the perishable group increased from R1.7 million to R3.3 million. The situation is particularly bad on the Transcaucasian, Volga, October, Kuybyshev, North Caucasus, and Central Asian railroads. The main causes are delayed deliveries, failure to comply with temperature requirements, unjustified reductions in the number of specialists on main lines (inspectors, refrigerated-car technicians, and so on) that have brought about the relaxation of requirements that freight shippers comply with state standards for quality and packaging, and lengthy idle time for cars while freight is processed.

There is every opportunity to substantially reduce losses and diminish damage to perishable freight this year. To this end, the managers of stations, divisions, and administrations of railroads should reinforce control and the responsibility of shippers for complying with the state standards when loading freight. The freight capacity and volume of cars should be used better, and track routing should be used more extensively. Strict control by dispatchers over the accelerated movement of cars with perishable products and the loading and unloading ensured by shippers and recipients within the time limits set should be established. Special attention needs to be paid to the technical condition of refrigerated cars.

The development of technical facilities for freight handling and commercial operations is significant. As of now, about 60 percent of the station warehouses on the system date back to before the war and the revolution. Few new warehouses are under construction.

We need to outfit enterprises with the necessary weighing equipment; due to a shortage of it, about one-half of the freight is shipped without being weighed.

The situation with the safety of freight in transportation is critical, but it can be remedied.

Pechora Coal Concern Deplores Future Uncertainty

PM2310113690 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 20 Oct 90

[Report by Yevgeniy Kuznetsov from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] Our program is following the fortunes of the Intaugol [coal] concern, the sector's first such concern which was set up at the beginning of the year in the Pechora basin. According to a report by our correspondent Yevgeniy Kuznetsov, the situation is far from rosy there.

[Kuznetsov] Today people working within the concern have absolutely no idea what their future will be like. There are no legislative or other acts available to pave the way toward the transition to a market economy. The USSR president's decree on prices has yet to be elaborated in normative documents. Therefore the market as far as the miners are concerned is just like a carrot dangled out of reach.

The concern is barely managing to cope with the coal extraction program. Both technological and labor discipline are falling. Accidents are on the increase.

[B.V. Borisanov, chairman of the Intaugol coal concern] With no prices, and only the planned volume of output to go by, we have no idea what resources we will have at our disposal in 1991. For this reason we cannot consider a single program, be it capital construction or acquisition of equipment, and consequently also collaboration with our partners. The saddest thing of all is that we are losing advantageous, quite advantageous consumers, both inside the country and abroad. We would like the Soviet and Russian governments to define their mutual relations as soon as possible so as to minimize the effect on us and to enable us to get down to real work toward entering the market.

Auto Giant To Change to Small, Leasehold Units

PM2210153790 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0930 GMT 19 Oct 90

[Report by V. Vengrzhnovskiy and I. Grinenko; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Correspondent] The Yartsevo Dvigatel Plant—a giant and one of the "Avtozil" Production Association's 16 plants—has probably broken all conceivable and inconceivable records for unfinished construction projects in our country. As a result, by the time the changes began in the country's economic life the Dvigatel Plant had only just entered the initial stage of the commissioning and development of production capacity. Yet the Yartsevo plant determines the main strategy in the development of the motor vehicle industry in this country and the switching of the Zil vehicle family's range of trucks to economical diesel engines. It is under these conditions that the plant's collective is having to embark on market relations. What ways of switching to the market do you envisage, Gennadiy Aleksandrovich?

[G.A. Bogdanov, plant director] We will be switching the bulk of our subdivisions to lease relations. We will be creating small enterprises associated with the plant.

[Correspondent] Gennadiy Aleksandrovich, as is well known, a USSR presidential decree has been adopted on maintaining established economic ties. How will the implementation of the decree's provisions affect your enterprise?

[Bogdanov] In many cases we simply do not have ties of this sort. We see it as helping us to organize associations together with Zil plants and production associations in the Smolensk area. In other words, their ties will become our ties.

[Correspondent] Today there can be no such thing as an ordinary approach to the resolution of the economic problems affecting the Dvigatel Plant and the Avtozil Association as a whole. Consequently the decision has been made to include the plant on the list of the country's most important construction projects.

Industrial Alliance Set Up Based on Bratsk Timber

PM2210145990 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 18 Oct 90

[Report by N. Vidonov and V. Korop; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpt] [Announcer] According to the USSR State Committee for Statistics 24 concerns, 17 intersectorial state associations [MGO], and 346 other associations have been registered to date. A total of some 600 amalgamations of this kind are operating in the national economy at present. Perhaps these figures as such are meaningless, but all this is, of course, to facilitate the transition to a market economy. The concerns and associations are changing the cumbersome and discredited system of ministerial management. The first such concern has been set up in Bratsk.

[Correspondent] A multisectorial, multipurpose alliance, essentially a Union-wide alliance of enterprises, some of which appear to have little in common, has been established here on a voluntary basis. It already comprises some 40 enterprises, including the Lenbummash science-and-production association, the Ryazan Khimvolokno, the Saratov Diagnostika science and technology center, the Cherenginskiy and Baykalskiy paper and pulp combines, joint ventures and cooperatives, and even the Bratsk City Soviet Executive Committee. But, naturally, the enterprises of the Bratsk timber industry complex form the nucleus and the basis of the new concern. The pooling of resources and scientific developments on the basis of common interest, the development of own machine building and marketing facilities, and retooling of production capacities and their switch to different

types of output will make it possible for the region to change from a raw materials appendage into an important producer of finished high-grade goods—excellent paper instead of pulp, badly needed graded packaging materials instead of cardboard, and sought-after shampoos and detergents instead of tallows, and much more.

The concern will form an alternative sector, a Goslesprom state corporation, replacing the former Ministry of the Timber Industry [Minlesprom]. However, even having acquired the desired independence, the concern will not stand aloof, it will not break off existing business ties. It intends to work together with old and new partners on the basis of mutually advantageous contracts. [passage omitted]

Scientific

Orbital Data Published for Cosmos-2102 Satellite

PM2310161190 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 18 Oct 90 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Satellite Launched"]

[Text] Another artificial earth satellite, Cosmos-2102, was launched in the Soviet Union on 16 October 1990 atop a Soyuz rocket.

The satellite is carrying scientific apparatus for continued space research.

The satellite was placed in the following orbit:

initial duration of revolution—89.8 minutes;

maximum distance from the Earth's surface (at apogee)—362 km;

minimum distance from Earth's surface (at perigee)—192 km.

[no angle of inclination given as published]

As well as scientific apparatus, the satellite has on board a radio system for precise measurements of orbital elements and a radio telemetric system for transmitting data to the ground on the operation of instruments and scientific apparatus. The apparatus on the satellite is operating normally. The computer coordination center is processing the incoming information.

Mir Cosmonauts Continue Experiments

LD2310153690 Moscow TASS in English 1300 GMT 23 Oct 90

[Text] Moscow October 23 TASS—Cosmonauts Gennadiy Manakov and Gennadiy Strekalov continue to carry out experiments aboard the Soviet Mir space station.

They have used the Gallar installation to produce gallium arsenide semi-conducting monocrystals in conditions of weightlessness. The experiment was carried out within the framework of an extensive space technology programme.

Spectrometer devices installed outside the Kvant-2 module were used to carry out a series of astrophysical experiments to measure solar radiation.

The crew has prepared for work the Svet greenhouse created by Soviet and Bulgarian specialists for fresh experiments and studies of the development of superior forms of vegetation in space conditions. Radishes and lettuce will be grown this time.

Under a plan for medical check-ups, the cosmonauts have been subjected to an examination to define how their cardio-vascular systems react to measured physical load.

Military

U.S., Soviet Military 'Openness' Pondered

PM2210150390 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 20 Oct 90 First Edition p 2

[Article by candidate of military sciences Lieutenant General N. Brusnitsyn: "When the Walls Come Tumbling Down. Trust, Partnership, and States' Information Sovereignty"]

[Text] **The processes of expansion of Soviet society's glasnost and openness have resulted in the lifting of numerous restrictions on access to previously classified information in our country. Including various aspects of the Armed Forces' activity. Does this means that all "secrets" are now a matter of the past? And if not, where is the golden mean which makes it possible to achieve a harmony between society's openness and the protection of confidential information from foreign intelligence services? Finally, how should such issues be resolved and how are they resolved in, say, the United States—a country long-accustomed to calling itself an "open society"? These topics are pondered by Lieutenant General N. Brusnitsyn, deputy chairman of the USSR Military Commissariat [Gostekhkomissiya], a leading expert on protection of information from intelligence-gathering technology and participant in the preparation of materials for the USSR-U.S. talks on the limitation of strategic offensive weapons.**

Nobody in the world doubts that information has become a real asset, a commodity, an intellectual property. This being so, its protection is an inseparable component of any state's activity aimed at ensuring its security, sovereignty, and independence. In the conditions of competitiveness and market economy the Americans, for example, concluded a long time ago that it is impossible to successfully conduct business without satisfying these demands. One of the very first laws on the

protection of information was adopted there by the U.S. National Bureau of Standards way back in 1902. At present the structure of information protection organs, headed by the National Security Council, comprises executive organs—a coordinating group and the National Committee for Security of Communications Systems and Automated Systems; scientific research institutions—the "National Computer Security Center," famous for its elaboration of demands regarding the protection of computer information against unauthorized access; and special skills committees and test laboratories.

The protection system, created in the interests of the U.S. Department of Defense, is presently more and more involved in the protection of commercial information. It safeguards secrets whose publication could cause damage running into tens of billions of dollars. We are talking about classified technology for the production of priority categories of arms and military equipment. For example, research and development work on the "Stealth" fighter-bomber was conducted in conditions of strictest secrecy and secretiveness. And even though the aircraft was officially presented to the public once its trials were completed, the composition of its coating remains a secret.

In our own country, in the complex conditions of transition to market relations, it is exceptionally important to determine the ways to ensure the state's information sovereignty. I think that this task must be resolved within the framework of a uniform state policy based on a firm legislative basis and having the appropriate executive and monitoring mechanism. We proceed from the premise that, in today's conditions of superarmaments, no state's security can be built in disregard for other states' interests.

Over the last few years, the joint USSR-U.S. efforts on openness in the military sphere and the lower level of armaments have not essentially diminished the sides' defense capability, but they have made it possible to take major military-political steps to eliminate the threat to peace. Here is an example. During the "cold war" period, when the United States enjoyed superiority in atomic weapons, President D. Eisenhower's "open" sky proposal in the mid-fifties was not accepted by the Soviet side. At that time, this method of intelligence gathering was justifiably perceived as a legal method for accurately "tying in" strategic targets on our territory. But as military equilibrium was established, the sides' desire to stabilize the military-political situation through accurate information about each other acquired a diametrically opposite importance—it enhanced strategic stability. Therefore in 1989, and in response to President Bush's "open" sky initiative, the Soviet side not only agreed to discuss this problem in detail but also put forward a counterproposal—to adopt "openness" also on land and at sea.

As we can see, a kind of reappraisal of values has occurred. Countries wish to know about each other in the military and other spheres of activity so as to convince themselves of the absence of aggressive intentions. Hence the special role played by national and international technical monitoring means which should be used as an instrument of peace rather than of war.

In the last two years alone, the Soviet Union made proposals to organize a large-scale mechanism to monitor the performance of agreements on the easing of international tension. They include the creation of a global system to monitor radiation safety by using space-based communications lines; a monitoring system to prevent the deployment of arms in space; an observation and monitoring agency under UN auspices with a multilateral center for cooperation in the monitoring sphere; a space observation agency; and a European center to reduce the danger of war. The USSR and the United States could also exchange intelligence data and information on so-called "hot spots" on the planet for the purpose of easing tension and coordinating actions.

The presence of such systems would make it possible to objectively appraise the military situation in the world, to forecast the future, and to promptly take political measures. As for intelligence-gathering means as such, they would be more correctly designated both in the USSR and abroad and would start being used as national technical means for monitoring or observation.

Space-based monitoring means are a special topic, and they could include space-based apparatus with photographic or optical-electronic equipment with a resolution of 0.3m. It seems to us that any observation of facilities, weapons systems, and troop operations with such resolution is perfectly adequate in the contemporary situation to perform the tasks of interstate accords on confidence-building measures and in the military sphere.

Unfortunately, some Western countries, which had formerly been actively advocating monitoring in words, do not always accept its broad application when specific situations are discussed. For example, when defining their positions on the monitoring of ground-based mobile ballistic missiles, our partners gave more attention not to monitoring the total quantity of such missiles but to ways to detect the location of any installation so as to ensure an opportunity to deliver a preventive strike against it. A long time was also spent looking for mutual understanding on the monitoring of sea-launched cruise missiles with nuclear charges, even though means for such monitoring can be developed for practical use in a very short time.

Unfortunately, matters so far do not stand as simply as that as regards the "open skies," either. The Soviet Union proposes a standard aircraft with agreed monitoring equipment, a single data processing center, and an opportunity for data exchange on a sufficiency basis. The United States insists on its own aircraft, fitted with its own data processors, and, naturally, the right to exclusive use. Is it possible to talk about reciprocal openness here?

It is possible and necessary, in our opinion. Mutual trust presupposes the implementation of monitoring on positions agreed in treaties, as well as reliable protection of data comprising the state's information resources and not covered by agreements. Given good will, the successful solution of all these problems is feasible. After all, serious achievements already exist in arms monitoring, without which there could have been neither the Treaty on Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles, nor confidence in the real possibility to conclude agreements on strategic offensive weapons, conventional arms and armed forces in Europe, and others.

The world is impatiently awaiting from our two states new steps to ease international tension and the signing of the agreement on a 50-percent reduction of strategic offensive arms. Mutual trust and partnership provide a sound foundations for this.

Yazov Addresses Military Trade Unions Congress

PM2310092190 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 20 Oct 90 First Edition p 2

[Report by correspondent P. Altunin: "What Will the Federation Be Able to Do? Remarks on the Results of the Constituent Congress of the Armed Forces Workers and Employees Trade Unions"]

[Excerpts] [passage omitted] The trade unions have already made their presence felt during the period of perestroyka. Today we can see them, in many production sectors, boldly tackling the solution of urgent problems and upholding the working people's interests in deed rather than just in words.

The 19th Trade Unions Congress is due to open in a few days' time, and major hopes are pinned on it. Very recently, when the USSR Supreme Soviet session was discussing the question of public associations and some people wanted to "harness" the trade unions there, the "trade union" deputies offered powerful resistance and the amendment which was adopted singled out the trade unions' special role and their own rights as regards protecting the working people's interests. [passage omitted]

A major event occurred quite recently: The constituent congress of the Federation of [Army and Navy] Workers and Employees Trade Unions (this was reported by KRASNAYA ZVEZDA]. Delegates from all branches of the Armed Forces took part in it. The businesslike and at times sharp debate lasted two days. "What should the Army trade union be like?"—this question perturbed everyone.

Keynote speaker G. Bashtanyuk, chairman of the Organizational Committee and secretary of the AUCCTU [All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions], and delegates emphasized that the very idea of uniting the trade union movement in the Armed Forces emerged a long time ago, actually among the "grassroot" organizations. People wished to rise up to the level of understanding all-Army tasks, they wanted greater cohesion and determination, and ultimately greater efficiency at work. [passage omitted]

Let us cite the statute: "In its activity, the Federation is independent of state management and military command organs, of military-political organs, and of party and public organizations; it is neither subordinate nor accountable to them, and cooperates with them on an equal basis."

Do you not agree that such words would have sounded strange just a few years ago, when trade unions were just "transmission belts"? They could only "help to fulfill instructions" and "mobilize the masses," and now we have talk about autonomy, lack of subordination, and being one's own master. What can you do, these are truly new times which enhance working people's rights and do away with leadership institutions' complacency in relations with the trade unions.

At the same time, the Federation's new leaders emphasized that its formation means not the destruction of prevailing trade union structures but further consolidation of the trade union movement in the Army and Navy, even though on the basis of totally new principles. [passage omitted]

Of course, it cannot be said that hitherto the Ministry of Defense had paid no attention to the workers' and employees' housing and daily life problems. Addressing the congress, Army General V. Arkhipov, USSR deputy defense minister and chief of the USSR Armed Forces' Rear Services, cited the following data: Despite all the complexities in the housing question, last year workers and employees were given one out of every nine apartments allocated for servicemen, 93.8 percent of workers and employees have switched to new labor remuneration conditions (in terms of higher wages, of course), up to 100,000 persons undergo in-patient treatment at military medical institutions, more than 20,000 receive travel vouchers for sanatoriums, about 10,000 vacation at military tourist facilities with more than one-half of them receiving subsidized travel vouchers, in other words at one-third of actual costs.

True enough, Comrade V. Arkhipov admitted that this is by no means sufficient: Workers' and employees' housing conditions leave much to be desired, those who need hospitalization do not always manage to find places, and there is a shortfall of (?867) creches and kindergartens with places for 91,000 children.

What does the market hold in store? An extremely keen discussion on this topic developed at the congress. The Supreme Soviet is in the process of adopting a package of laws on social guarantees for and protection of the population. But trade unions, including those in the Army, must be vigilant. They cannot deliberately support unemployment, and the AUCCTU proposes that persons temporarily out of work should be paid an allowance of between 50 and 70 percent of their average wage for a period of 18 months.

The employment service ought to be developed. The following example was cited at a news conference held after the congress: The trade union leadership in Sweden (using computers, of course) can tell at any given moment whereabouts in the country a specialist in a given field is needed.

There was also talk about the fact that [trade unions] must be more active and even pushing when it comes to job placement, and must respond to the situation quickly. In reply to a question, A. Opekunov, chairman of the Trade Union of Working People in Military and Specialized Construction Organizations Central Committee, announced that about 50,000 persons have left construction organizations to join cooperatives in the last two years. Obviously, the military construction industry leadership had failed to maintain people's interest. Now, even though belatedly, they seem to have realized this: They have started setting up their own cooperatives and leasing, and seriously intend to engage in commercial activity.

It was only natural that people at the congress repeatedly raised the question of the Army trade union's former functions and of the assets it has accumulated; they would bring tangible benefits and it would be inexpedient to abandon them.

Colonel General N. Shlyaga, chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate, said the following in his speech:

"People here and there have recently raised the question of whether trade unions and their elected organs should give attention to combat readiness, production, education of trade union members, and strengthening of labor discipline. This is supposedly a matter for the administration, while our job is to protect working people's interests.... I think that the aforementioned issues cannot remain outside the scope of trade union influence, and here we must not blindly copy the work methods of trade unions in capitalist countries. We also need to more closely cooperate in information, propaganda, and education work, in the struggle against carelessness, indiscipline, economic mismanagement, and waste."

Marshal of the Soviet Union D. Yazov, USSR minister of defense, addressed the congress. He spoke in detail about the situation in the Army and Navy. In addition to daily tasks concerning the training of personnel and the enhancement of units' and ships' combat readiness, the military command and leaders of all ranks also have to deal with urgent matters raised by perestroyka, like conversion, cutbacks in the Armed Forces, implementation of military reform, and withdrawal of troops from East Europe and Mongolia. All this demands tremendous exertion of energy by personnel, including trade union members. Our task is to retain the best cadres, including workers and employees.

Comrade D. Yazov touched upon many topical questions of material and housing conditions for workers and employees in various categories and stationed in different parts of the country, including the Far North. He specifically said:

"We perceive the creation of the Federation of Workers and Employees Trade Unions as a manifestation of further democratization in the Armed Forces. I am convinced that our joint work will be aimed at performing the tasks facing the Army and Navy. And we will build this work on the basis of mutual respect and trust, the basis of total mutual understanding and partnership in the solution of social problems, and ultimately in strengthening the country's defense capability."

The congress delegates adopted an address to the USSR Supreme Soviet, which says in particular: "The congress recognizes that the Armed Forces, being flesh of the Soviet people's flesh, and the country as a whole experience a multitude of problems and shortcomings which have become the object of justified criticism by society. At the same time, the congress is firmly against the unconstructive and indiscriminate criticism of the Army and Navy, which pursues a single goal—to pit the Armed Forces against the people, to sow mistrust in servicemen, and to discredit those who ensure our motherland's reliable defense."

...A new organization has come into being—the Federation of Army and Navy Trade Unions. The thousands-strong collectives expect specific actions from it.

Moscow Citizens Trying To Avoid Conscription

LD2310155390 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1230 GMT 23 Oct 90

[Interview with Major General Bespalov, Moscow military commissioner, by reporter N. Ivanov; place and date not given—recorded]

[Text] The crisis in our Army is worsening. The current call up could be a critical moment in its development.

[N. Ivanov] The wave of those refusing to respond to the call up to the Soviet Army looks as if it has reached Moscow. In contrast to the Baltic and Transcaucasian opponents of service in the Soviet Army, their followers in Moscow usually pretend to be crazy. Only a few take the bold step of slitting their wrists. We are speaking today to Major General Bespalov, military commissioner of Moscow. What is the situation regarding the current autumn call-up in Moscow?

[Bespalov] If we take the first four days of this autumn call-up, of the 2,500 invited by the call up commission, more than 460 failed to present themselves. For the spring call up alone, we have instituted 462 criminal cases. There have been more cases recently among young people willing to get charged under any article rather than go and serve in the Armed Forces. Conscript Kravchenko, Dmitriy Yuriyevich, born in 1971 is an example. He told the call up commission that he did not want to serve in occupying troops. He sent a declaration to the president, and to the USSR minister of defense. Now he has taken himself off the military register and gone off to Riga. Will he go on the register? He will certainly hide.

Baltic Republics

Moscow-Baltic Ties Debated at FRG Foundation

PM2410091590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Oct 90 Union Edition p 3

[TASS report: "A Meeting Devoted to the Problems of the Baltic Republics"]

[Text] Koenigswinter, 21 Oct—An international meeting on problems of the Soviet Baltic republics opened in Koenigswinter on 20 October. It was arranged by the Friedrich Naumann Foundation, an organization close to the Social Democratic Party of Germany. Delegations from Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania; representatives of various social movements; and also politicians, scientists, and journalists from Sweden and Finland have come to Germany at the foundation's invitation.

The program of the meeting, which will last two days, includes such topical and contentious questions as prospects for mutual relations between the Baltic republics and the Union government; the settlement of interethnic conflicts; possible ways whereby Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania can achieve economic autonomy; their integration into the all-European security structures; and economic ties.

Representatives of the CPSU Central Committee and the CPSU Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences acquainted the participants in the meeting with the CPSU leadership's viewpoint on the problems under discussion.

Landsbergis Meets Hungarian Leaders in Budapest

LD2310193590 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1700 GMT 23 Oct 90

[Text] A meeting took place at the Hungarian Parliament between Lithuanian Supreme Council Chairman Vytautas Landsbergis and Hungarian leaders President Arpad Goncz and Parliament Chairman Gyorgy Szabad.

Questions of political, trade, and cultural cooperation were discussed during the course of the conversation.

Vytautas Landsbergis recalled that a 1937 cooperation agreement involving trade relations between Lithuania and Hungary, was still in effect. The leaders of the Hungarian State said that they see no obstacles to restoring diplomatic relations with Lithuania.

These issues will also be discussed prior to Vytautas Landsbergis' next visit to Hungary. Both sides agree that it will be expedient to draw up official agreements on that occasion.

Landsbergis Concludes Visit

LD2410111290 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 0900 GMT 24 Oct 90

[Text] The visit to Hungary by Lithuanian Supreme Council Chairman Vytautas Landsbergis has ended. This morning he flew to Moscow.

Before his departure, Landsbergis told an ELTA correspondent: The Budapest meetings were useful. I think they will serve to bring about a further rapprochement between the Hungarian and Lithuanian nations, whose historical destinies are very similar. More concrete political, humanitarian, and economic bilateral cooperation among the states, the sources of which go back to 1920, should commence very soon. We have agreed to meet with Hungarian President Arpad Goncz to discuss all aspects of cooperation further, he added.

Landsbergis Cites 'Increasing Threat' of USSR

91UN0085A Vilnius EKHO LITVY in Russian 20 Sep 90 p 1

["Declaration of the Presidium of the Lithuanian Republic Supreme Council"—EKHO LITVY headline]

[Text] The leadership of the USSR has been informed that the Lithuanian Republic does not intend to sign a Union treaty of republics in any form. It would not seem worthwhile to wear people down, stir up tensions, and inflict damage on their own economy and the economy of Lithuania while avoiding political negotiations and failing to abolish the consequences of World War II and to acknowledge Lithuania's independence. Unfortunately, they are acting otherwise. Responsible Soviet officials are refusing to provide guarantees on fulfillment of their agreements regarding the sale of resources and goods to Lithuania beginning as early as October 1990. We see a continuation of the blockade on banks, a diplomatic blockade, usurpation of Lithuania's western borders, armed intervention in civil affairs, and the terrorizing of youth who refuse to serve in a foreign army. Attempts of every variety are being made to destabilize the internal situation not only in Lithuania, and not only in the Baltic region. On 10 April 1990 the USSR president stated in a conversation with Komsomol [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League] congress delegates in Moscow that it would be inadmissible to redraw borders, that this might result in "all peoples and nations coming into collision." Conservative USSR forces are inciting precisely this, sending highly placed officials of the CPSU into Lithuania with the aim of misleading primarily the inhabitants of Lithuania of other nationalities. A great deal of financial and propaganda resources is being allocated to conduct this subversive activity, and new aggression is being planned. We call upon the peoples and democratic states of the world not to remain passive in the face of this ever increasing threat to the Baltic countries.

[Signed] V. Landsbergis, Chairman of the Lithuanian Republic Supreme Council

[Dated] Vilnius, 19 September 1990

Prunskiene Encouraged by Government-Parties Meeting

LD2310202690 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 2000 GMT 23 Oct 90

[Excerpt] A meeting took place in Vilnius today between Lithuanian Government leaders and members and various political party leaders. Kazimiera Prunskiene, chairman of the Lithuanian Council of Ministers; her deputy, Romualdas Ozolas; Foreign Minister Algirdas Saudargas; Minister of Health Protection Juozas Olekas; Minister of Forestry Economy Vaidotas Antanaitas; and others answered many disturbing questions.

Following this meeting correspondent Zenonas Miksys interviewed some of its participants. The first interview was with Kazimiera Prunskiene chairman of the Lithuanian Council of Ministers:

[Begin recording] [Miksys] How do you view this evening's meeting with representatives of various Lithuanian political parties?

[Prunskiene] Very positively because it was truly a very businesslike exchange, with very great attention paid to every question; and it was open, to the point, and marked by goodwill.

[Miksys] Would consolidation with these parties be possible among the government?

[Prunskiene] I believe it is not only possible but very necessary, and following today's meeting I see no obstacle to its implementation.

[Miksys] But many of the questions you probably had to answer were so very difficult for Lithuania....

[Prunskiene, interrupting] There are some questions that are very difficult to answer unilaterally. There are some proposals that really would be very complicated to adopt and, well, to implement because there are truly some separate parties and diverse interests, that is there are some group interests, and sometimes they are at cross purposes and it is necessary to find such decisions that would be maximally just and would create conditions for forming a new way of life.

[Miksys] Even though you are leaving the government meeting with your colleagues feeling tired, after two and a half hours, you are leaving in a pretty good mood?

[Prunskiene] It was truly very important and the mood is very good. Everyone inspired the work. From a certain confrontation I believe that we are going to change over to very fruitful cooperation. [end recording] [passage omitted]

Prunskiene Views Kaunas Anti-Government Criticisms

91UN0085B Vilnius EKHO LITVY in Russian 20 Sep 90 p 1

[Commentary by EKHO LITVY correspondent V. Butkus: "A Difficult Conversation"]

[Text] On Tuesday 18 September a meeting took place between Lithuanian Republic Prime Minister K. Prunskiene and the community of Kaunas at the Palace of Culture of the "Banga" Production Association. This is the subject of our correspondent's commentary.

In spite of their heavy work load, the prime minister and other members of the government often allocate time for trips across the republic and meetings with the residents of cities and villages of Lithuania. This helps both the government and the voters to "check their watches" on that difficult and bumpy road toward the restoration of our state independence which we are all traveling together today. Such a "time check" took place in Kaunas.

At the initiative of a group of deputies of the Kaunas City Soviet, an extraordinary session was convened last week whose agenda included the issue of the political, social and economic situation in the republic and the operational program of the city soviet. The subject of discussion immediately moved to lack of confidence in the government of the Lithuanian Republic. The government was accused of failing to this point to resolve important questions of consolidating the statehood of Lithuania, namely: the banking system not having been separated from the Soviet Union, no formation of a budget of independent Lithuania taking place, monetary reform not begun, Lithuania's borders and its ties with other countries not being controlled, radical economic and social reforms not being accomplished, and so forth. The government was also blamed for blocking the formation of property of self-governments and failing to facilitate implementation of the Law on the Foundations of Local Self-Government. Following the discussions, which I note in passing did not really touch upon the heart of the matter but dealt mostly with the version of a document already drawn up, the deputies voted in favor (no votes against, five abstentions) of a text which reads, in part: "This provides evidence to the fact that the Council of Ministers is carrying out a destructive policy regarding the independence of the Lithuanian Republic." After ratifying this document, the deputies decided to continue their session in several days time. Proposals were made to invite head of government K. Prunskiene to it.

An hour prior to the start of the meeting, people began filling up the small Palace of Culture hall, desiring to meet with the prime minister. "Radicals," the indispensable participants at many rallies, took up positions near the stage. This time they were carrying panels with outright demands: "Down With K. Prunskiene," "We Demand the Resignation of the Prunskiene Government," "No Communists Evermore," etc. It should be

noted right away that some of the meeting's participants were unable to show restraint and conducted themselves improperly, to put it mildly, interfering with businesslike discussion.

Nonetheless, anyone with a businesslike disposition—i.e. anyone who wished to listen—could do so. Prime Minister Prunskiene and Deputy Chairman of the Lithuanian Council of Ministers R. Ozolas, who accompanied her to the meeting, spoke candidly concerning the political and economic state of affairs that has taken shape today in our republic, and answered the numerous, mostly quite pointed questions from meeting participants.

K. Prunskiene devoted a significant portion of her comments to analyzing the accusations leveled by deputies of the Kaunas City Soviet against the government. Discussion centered primarily around how justified were the assertions that the government was hankering after the property rights of local self-governments and attempting to "pocket" even the canteens and barber shops. First of all, in the prime minister's view, the economic reform that will decide questions of property has just now begun. Another question is will Lithuania be able to sustain itself, being just a distinctive aggregate of self-governments claiming to possess everything located in their territory?

It must not be forgotten that the existence today of the Lithuanian economy, its stability, or at least its ability to avoid a depression depends first of all on how we will be able to provide ourselves with resources. Who will be concluding treaties with other states for shipments of oil, gas, metal, and other resources—each self-government individually, or Lithuania as a unified state?

Prime Minister Prunskiene went into considerable detail with respect to the state of affairs regarding the banking system, pointing out that the issue of monies necessary for providing salaries, paying out savings, etc., is not in our hands. Any unilateral actions are fraught with the possibility of serious consequences, since Lithuania obtains many varieties of raw materials from other republics at low prices, compensation for this going to the producer from an all-Union "pot" into which we too for the time being must contribute our share. There was also discussion of the activity of cooperatives, trade, additional protective measures for our republic market, prospects for negotiations with Moscow, and many other pressing problems which are troubling today not only for the people of Kaunas but for all the inhabitants of Lithuania.

R. Ozolas answered questions on the fate of archives of the Lithuanian KGB, military service of our youth in the Soviet Army, the situation in eastern Lithuania, and other matters.

"We live in difficult times," Ozolas stated. "But irresponsible actions on the part of certain individuals and groups are not helping to stabilize the situation in the republic."

A representative of the Kaunas Workers Union read the appeal of his organization to the Lithuanian Republic Council of Ministers and its chairman, which noted that the Lithuanian economy was in decline, the minimum standard of living was going down, the process of privatization was suspended, and leaders had compromised themselves and maintained their former positions. The appeal proposed that the government tender its resignation. A similar demand was made by representatives of people who are presently conducting a hunger strike outside the Council of Ministers.

Over the course of the two-hour meeting, the "temperature" of the hall rose continuously almost to boiling point, but the composure of the guests, their businesslike and straightforward responses, returned the assemblage to its normal course. Therefore, it is probably no accident that at its end one of the meeting's participants stated to the guests:

"It is difficult to say which people there are more of in the hall—supporters or opponents of Prunskiene. I can assure you that the lack of confidence in the government declared by city soviet deputies in no way reflects the true opinion of Kaunas people. Therefore I wish you success in your further efforts."

11 March Party Renamed 'Party of Independence'

LD2310211190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1900 GMT 23 Oct 90

[Report by correspondent Eleana Kurkletite from Vilnius]

[Excerpt] The constituent congress of the party named after 11 March finished its work in Vilnius yesterday. Its delegates decided to rename it as the Party of Independence. The creation of the party was initiated by a group of former Sajudis activists. Virgilijus Cepaitis, deputy of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet and chairman of the Commission on Citizens Rights and Ethnic Issues, has become the chairman of the Party of Independence.

The new party is not an ideological one, it is a party of action. And that is why, according to Cepaitis, it can be supported by broad strata of population. However, the majority of deputies adopted a directive saying that former members of the Lithuanian Communist Party cannot participate in the formation of the party. They can support it, however. All Lithuania's citizens, regardless of their nationality, can become members of the party if ideas of the most rapid implementation of independence concern them closely. There are about 600 members in the party. The program has a lot in common with programs of the two already existing parties—the Tautininkai Union and the Democrats. In general, there are over 20 various parties, movements, and public organizations in Lithuania today. [passage omitted]

Poor Lithuanian Economic Performance Detailed

LD2310213990 Moscow TASS in English 2113 GMT 23 Oct 90

[By TASS correspondent Kazis Uscilla]

[Text] Vilnius October 23 TASS—The gross social product dropped by 5.3 per cent in Lithuania over the past nine months, national income by ten per cent and labour productivity fell by 9.2 per cent, the Statistics Department of the Lithuanian Government reports today.

The statistical report notes that Lithuanian industry's output was four per cent less than in the corresponding period last year. The production of consumer goods slid by 2.4 per cent as against the corresponding period last year and of foodstuffs by 6.7 per cent.

The republic produced much less sugar, fish products and canned meat and fish.

Indicators in construction are also disheartening. Builders have turned over for tenancy 37 per cent of the annual volume of housing. They built 1,808 flats less than last year.

The social and economic situation has also been aggravated by the fact that the incomes of population rose by 13 per cent as compared with the corresponding period last year.

Ignalina Nuclear Power Station Block Shut Down

LD2310225890 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 2200 GMT 23 Oct 90

[Text] Yesterday [22 October] at midday, the first block of the Ignalina Nuclear Electric Power Station was shut down due to an error in its automated system.

The incident was unusually late in being reported, approximately 24 hours later. It was asserted that no damage was caused by the reactor's shutdown.

The reactor may be restarted no earlier than tomorrow [24 October] afternoon.

Disunity in Estonian Foreign Policy Examined

LD2310200790 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1140 GMT 23 Oct 90

[By correspondent Albert Maloveryan]

[Text] Tallin, 23 October (TASS)—The recent trip by Edgar Savisaar, head of the Estonian Government, to the United States and his meetings with President George Bush and representatives of the American business community have not altered the American Administration's attitude to the so-called "Baltic issue". This opinion is shared by many local observes who attentively followed the course of the Estonian prime minister's visit to the United States.

Tiit Made, member of the Estonian Parliament, thinks that the goal of the trip was "to compensate for the failures of Savisaar's government in Estonia, especially in the area of economic reform, through political dividends acquired abroad". The continuing decline of production in almost all industries, an unbalanced commodity market, gaps in the state budget, and rising food prices do not make the government more popular.

Some observers are inclined to believe that the overseas trip and the audience at the White House were a goal in itself for the Estonian prime minister. To become the first meant scoring several points for the head of the Estonian Government at the expense of his political and personal rival, Arnold Ruutel, chairman of the Supreme Council. Apparently for this reason the visit to the United States itself and many of its details were kept secret almost to the last moment. Thus Ruutel admitted to journalists that he had learned of Savissar's forthcoming trip "only a week before his departure".

Inevitably, the private rivalry between the two leaders has turned into a rivalry between the parliament and the government which, according to what (Yak Alliik) said in a recent speech to the parliament, strives to prove that the cabinet "cannot do without help from the legislative body".

The lack of concord between the parliament and the government, in the view of the observers, has led to Estonia being short of unity in foreign political issues.

Lennart Meri, minister of foreign affairs, is primarily busy establishing and maintaining contacts in the West. His colleague Endel Lippmaa, minister without portfolio, is responsible for conducting talks on granting Estonia independence. Although more than once he has given public assurances of the unity of Estonian foreign policy, his tone betrays resentment more than confidence since Lippmaa's itineraries are not very diverse. And while he "shuttles" between Tallinn and Moscow, his "Western" colleague goes on foreign tours.

Many parliamentarians who think that success in the West would promote progress in the East, and vice versa, are beginning to come out more often in favor of a unity that is not simply declared but real.

Russians From Estonia Protest RSFSR Treaty

91UN0097B Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 17 Oct 90 Second Edition p 3

[Report by N. Maandi, press attache for the Interregional Council of People's Deputies and Workers' Dellegates in Estonia: "On Opposite Banks"]

[Text] In a small room on the 10th floor of the building where the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Supreme Soviet works, the office chief, chairman of the subcommittee on interrepublic relations F.V. Shelov-Kovedyayev and his aides received some unusual guests—deputies of the Estonian Supreme

Soviet who express the interests of the Russian-speaking population for whom the treaty between Russia and Estonia now being worked out will supposedly provide safeguards, among other tasks of course.

One clarification is needed here. On 2 October 1990 the draft of a treaty on interstate relations between the RSFSR and the Estonian Republic was submitted to an extraordinary (closed) session of the Estonian Supreme Soviet for its consideration. In this connection the deputy groups "For Equal Rights," "Cooperation," "The Communist Faction," and "Virumaa" announced that since they had been denied any opportunity to participate through their own representatives in the preparation of that draft treaty or in the agreement of positions as part of the official delegation, and thus express the vital interests of the non-Estonian population, and since they did not have direct official meetings with the leadership of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, they did not consider it possible to take part in the discussion of that document.

This decision resulted from the fact that no one from the Russian delegation met with the labor collectives, or even representatives of the non-Estonian population in Estonia, or showed any interest in what safeguards they needed or what problems required any particular solution. Moreover, when the delegation from the RSFSR Supreme Soviet to the negotiations was in Estonia in Tallinn, its members, including its leader, did not even want to talk with deputies from the Estonian Supreme Soviet who express the interests of the Russian-speaking population. And then those deputies themselves went to Moscow and to the Supreme Soviet of Russia.

I shall try to share my own personal observations regarding how all this came about. On the day that the deputies met with F. Shelov-Kovedyayev at the entrance of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet building I saw a group of people. They were holding placards: "They do not want to hear us in Estonia's parliament! Will the Parliament of Russia listen?" "The secret deal between Russia and Estonia means 640,000 Russian-speaking refugees!" "People's deputies of Russia, do not be led by the nose by Estonian extremists!" "The Russians and Estonians expect help, not betrayal." It turned out that these Russians had come to Moscow especially to make the parliamentarians of Russia aware of their aspirations and their pain.

But at that time Vladimir Lebedev, the chairman of the Interregional Council of Deputies and Workers' Delegates in Estonia—the organ of self-government and safeguards for the interests of the public which the laws of the republic itself limit—had already shown the deputies of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet at a plenary session that the RSFSR as a republic that deemed itself part of the USSR cannot conclude a treaty that is at variance with the Constitution and other legal enactments of the Soviet Union, and that it has no objective valid reasons to rush to conclude this kind of treaty with Estonia before the new Union treaty, in preparation of which Russia is also taking part, has been signed, or before a final determination of the status of Estonia in accordance with the standards of international law.

And the present authorities in Estonia are rushing to this treaty primarily because, having failed to gain recognition of Estonia's status as a republic, they think that with the help of this treaty they will achieve recognition from the RSFSR. In their official statement the deputies remind their colleagues in the Russian legislature that in recent years the Estonian Supreme Soviet has passed a number of legislative enactments that legitimize racial discrimination on the basis of national-ethnic attributes. Proceeding from the nationalist premise that the Estonian nation has priority, these laws limit the right of the individual to freedom of movement, to be employed in a whole range of official posts, select his place of residence and type of employment, and possess property for a significant group of the republic's population—these are creating a situation of constant tension.

"Having concluded the planned treaty with Estonia—a state that is pursuing the policy and practice of discrimination against the Russian-speaking population in that republic—the RSFSR in turn will be in direct violation of Article 2, clause 1, subparagraph C. of the 'International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination' dated 7 March 1966, and will be party to racial discrimination against part of the population of Estonia," say the deputies in their statement. The statement also notes the following not unimportant detail: National discrimination here is also social discrimination since 80 percent of the working class in Estonia is made up of a Russian-speaking population.

The language of the documents is dry and circumspect. But at the meeting with F. Shelov-Kovedyayev the deputies spoke in the language of specific examples and concrete facts. Aleksey Zybin was elected as a deputy by 16,000 people, but many received no more than 3,000 votes. And all of them were elected under the law on elections passed by the Estonian Supreme Soviet. At local enterprises the prices for products and wages are almost double those at enterprises of all-Union subordination, and it is precisely in those collectives that more than 90 percent of the people are Russian-speaking. Servicemen and their families in Estonia are not registered, and those who have not lived there for 25 years are not now being given housing; people who are not citizens of the republic are unable to buy apartments or have private property; and it is proposed that only persons who have lived there since before 1940, or their direct descendants through the mother's line, (?) can become citizens.

True, F. Shelov-Kovedyayev did object to Aleksey Zybin's remark about citizenship: The draft treaty grants the right of choice of citizenship. What choice? If they refuse me citizenship in Estonia, I remain a citizen on my own personal declaration of Russia, the Ukraine, Belorussia and so forth but live on the territory of Estonia with all the consequences stemming from that

with respect to housing, private property, opportunities to obtain an education, the right to work, and so on and so forth.... However who today can guarantee that this will all be an acceptable framework for a person and that his rights will not be violated? Can it really be that the Russians who are today preparing the treaty with Estonia are better aware of and understand better the situation in the neighboring republic than non-Estonians who have lived, do live, and will continue to live in Estonia? Is it not strange that no one has even asked them? Is this not discrimination? Is it not a deal made behind the backs of the Russian-speaking population in Estonia?

"No, no, no!" For almost 2 hours Shelov-Kovedyayev and his aides argued with the parliamentarians from Estonia. In their opinion, what was happening was that the Russians in Estonia do not understand the advantages that this treaty will bring them.

However, they were actively opposed by deputies from the RSFSR Supreme Soviet—Viktor Antonov (Pskov Oblast), Igor Ivanov (Kingiseppskiy Rayon, Leningrad Oblast), Serafim Ivanov (Ostrovskiy Rayon, Pskov oblast)—to whom all these problems appear somewhat differently than they do to Fedor Shelov-Kovedyayev and his aides. Probably because these deputies' voters who live in the border areas with Estonia are beginning to sense, not in some speculative way but, if you will pardon the expression, on their own backs what territorial claims are when young men from the Estonian "Kaytseliyt" and the self-defense league come to their villages, and start to establish their own border markers on the village fences; and what economic boundaries are when for a bottle of beer purchased just down the road—but in Estonia—a man must obtain a license from the Trade Licensing Parliament of Estonia after first paying R50 for state customs. If you find that hard to believe, telephone 683-453 and 683-530 at the Estonian licensing department or pick up the newspaper SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA for 2 October 1990 and read the information presented on page 4. And Deputy I. Ivanov from Kingiseppskiy Rayon was right when he said at the meeting that all these issues, particularly those affecting boundaries as well as economic and political issues, are delayed-action mines. And since they have been put in place, Russia should start making preparations to receive refugees from the border areas between Estonia and Leningrad and Pskov oblasts because the entire way of life—the common communications with Narva, the electricity network, and so forth—for Ivangorod, for example, will be completely disrupted....

To whose advantage is this treaty? Who needs it?

Postscript

On Saturday 13 October a meeting against the proposed establishment of the so-called economic boundary between Estonia and Russia took place in Narva city, attended by thousands of people. Inhabitants of the cities of Narva, Sillamyae, Kokhtla-Yarve, Tallinn, Tartu, Pryanu, and other Estonian cities, and also from the Russian cities of Ivangorod, Kingisepp, and Slantsy were present. An appeal adopted at the meeting states the following in particular: "We do not wish to reconcile ourselves to the fact that the negotiations between the Estonian Republic and Russia and the USSR, which affect the interests of hundreds of thousands people living on the opposite banks of the Narva River, are being conducted behind our backs." Incidentally, the meeting took place under the slogan "We say 'NO' to the policy and to borders separating peoples, relatives, and friends!"

Estonian Defense Forces Conflict Foreseen

91UN0098A Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 16 Oct 90 First Edition p 2

[Report on interview with writer Platon Afanasyev by KRASNAYA ZVEZDA correspondent Captain Second Rank V. Urban; place and date not given: "How 'Kaytseliyt' Prepared for Its Campaign"]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] [Urban] It seems to me you are giving in to the idea that the views of the Estonian National Congress (ENK) are becoming more and more important in the republic....

[Afanasyev] This organization includes six parties of nationalist persuasion. It recognizes only the republic government created abroad, the emigre government. Everything is being repeated. Just as previously the Communist Party gradually surrendered positions to the People's Front, today's leadership is readily retreating in front of the ENK. Tunne Kelam, a Congress leader, personally told me what can you expect from former All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League [Komsomol] workers now entrenched in the government under new slogans. Do you see the confrontation? It will intensify with each passing day.

[Urban] All this is personal, subjective evaluation. Look, Platon Sokratovich, let us get back to the facts.

[Afanasyev] I have no objection to that. Many events have passed before my eyes, but now I will attempt to structure them in a chain sequence. On 23 August the ENK stated its claims openly—today's borders between Estonia and Russia must be revised in favor of Estonia. What happens next? On 2 September "Kaytseliyt," the union protecting and supporting the Congress—in essence its organ—places border posts on Russian territory, that is where the prewar boundary ran. Enough has already been said about this action in the press. Therefore I only want to address one point. The aim of the exercises was declared openly—to work out a command and control system in the event "Kaytseliyt" is urgently required to "undertake actions on the border."

[Urban] Objections may ensue since the republic government has condemned the "Kaytseliyt" actions. Also, this

paramilitary organization itself has not yet been officially acknowledged in Estonia on the republic level. Perhaps this should also be "entered" in your chain sequence?

[Afanasyev] "Kaytseliyt" is officially registered in all uyezds. And so the "will" of the government here has nothing to do with it. But what is "Kaytseliyt?" Prior to 1940 it was a civilian organization to assist the Army. In wartime its members fulfilled guard and protection functions. This is what "Kaytseliyt" strives to do today, if you throw away the publicity cover. Certain newspapers, PYARNUSKIYE IZVESTIYA for example, are publishing reports that are in essence the orders of staffs of local organizations. The summer training assembly of young "guards" has taken place. The newspaper LYAANE ELU reported that "uyezd adviser 'for order'" Kabul was not reluctant to issue automatic weapons, pistols, and sniper rifles to lads from his warehouse for shooting on the firing range."

[Urban] It was said that following that same "exercise," the defense minister of the Estonian emigre government, Yu. Toomeluu, a citizen of the United States, conferred upon "Kaytseliyt" head K. Eller the rank of colonel in the Estonian Army. Is this also for publicity? There being a colonel but no army....

[Afanasyev] Just wait a bit—there will be. I do not know what it will be called—a "shadow" army or something else—but all of this will come. It is clearly evident here who is receiving the support of "the community abroad." And that same Eller did not hide the reasons for the "exercises." There were rumors, he said, that Premier Savisaar intended to participate in preparation of a Union treaty. "Kaytseliyt" therefore intended simply to plan a conflict and thereby "trip up the head of the government." Recently "Kaytseliyt" declared that a registration was beginning of volunteers to defend... Kuwait. Here you see where "Kaytseliyt" has gone. But this is for publicity, of course—I agree with you here. But it is also to replenish its ranks. "Kaytseliyt" currently has on the order of 4,000 people. But....

R. Tamme, chairman of the Defense Commission of the republic parliament, declared the necessity of creating their own, a governmental armed forces in the Estonian Republic—two divisions numbering 15-16,000 men. They have even received a name already—"Kodu Kaytse" ("Home Defense").

Where do I see an alarming symptom here? A conflict between these groups—"Kaytseliyt" and "Kodu Kaytse"—is possible at any moment. And if they obtain weapons? For the time being we see a rivalry of views, let us put it that way. It began back in the summer. A public opinion survey was conducted, results of which were published immediately: Arnold Ruutel, chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the republic, was supported by 68 percent of those polled, and Tunne Kelam by just one percent.... In response the ENK began a war of statistics, stating that survey results show it has the support of 62 percent of the Estonian population. And this was immediately broadcast by Radio Free Europe in the Estonian language....

So here we see both the government and the ENK getting their own armed formations. In short, "public survey" battles and wars of words may grow into real battles.

I think "Kaytseliyt" is conducting a constituent assembly 20 October, not by accident in Tartu. After this it will return to "business."

[Urban] Presently there is no such "business?"

[Afanasyev] A notice appeared in the newspaper RAKHVA KHYAEL to follow troop movements—Soviet, of course—track every soldier and officer....

[Urban] And report this where?

[Afanasyev] They gave the address: Estonian National Congress, P.O. Box 3425, Tallinn. Enough examples?

[Urban] Your prognosis is not very optimistic, Platon Sokratovich. I think people will argue with you. Are you prepared for such meetings?

[Afanasyev] Any time.

Lauristin Assesses Estonia-RSFSR Talks

91UN0097A Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA in Russian 5 Oct 90 p 1

[Report on interview with M. Lauristin by N. Kuznetsova; place and date not given: "What Does the Treaty Stand For? Estonian Republic Supreme Soviet Delegation Member M. Lauristin Comments on the Results of the Closed Session of Negotiations With the RSFSR"]

[Text] [Kuznetsova] The latest session of the republic Supreme Soviet, at which the results of the talks between the Estonian Republic and the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic [RSFSR] were considered, evoked great interest among readers. Since the session was a closed one, reportage on it ("...But They Left Us Behind Closed Doors") was based on interviews with deputies at the end of the session. They expressed their OWN [as published] viewpoints on the procedure for drawing up the treaty and the consideration of it. You obviously have a different viewpoint. I would like our readers to know about it. In this connection, this is my first question: Why did the delegation to the talks with Russia not deem it possible to include a representative of the Russian-speaking population, which has resulted in misunderstanding not only among deputies but also among the greater part of the electorate? Even more, even a certain distrust regarding the talks....

[Lauristin] Well you see, all these problems connected with representation are not something that has just occurred, that is they do not relate just to the period in which the delegation was formed.... The important point of reckoning, if I may express it thus, was when the attitude of the Russian faction of deputies to the talks

was clearly and definitely expressed on 7 August. At that time a resolution was passed on talks with Russia and the Union. And it was precisely then that the Russian-speaking deputies decided not to participate in the debate on this issue and not to move to search for mutually acceptable conditions, but simply walked out of the hall. It was the exact day when the Supreme Soviet decided on the positions with which it would enter into negotiations that the deputies ostentatiously refused to stand on a common platform with all the Supreme Soviet. And this is the question that arises: Does this confrontational stand express the interests and opinion of all the Russian-speaking population...? This is also a problem of representation.

If we look at the results of the polls and if we simply meet with Russian-speaking voters, and each of us has done this, then it can be clearly seen that people who speak Russian do not represent any kind of monolith in Estonia. So why do the representatives of the nonindigenous population in the Supreme Soviet prefer to assume a united position of confrontation? For it is precisely this that is in general the root of the entire situation. How can these people, who have refused to take part in the formation of the platform for the negotiations, be given powers by this same Supreme Soviet to conduct negotiations?

There is another factor. I would not describe the composition of the delegation from the standpoint of nationality. This is a rigid approach when Estonians should talk only on behalf of Estonians and disregard the interests of the Russians, and this also means the opposite—it is at root false.

And a third factor. Right at the start of the talks the Russian delegation immediately announced that one of its tasks or aims was to safeguard the rights of Russian citizens who live in Estonia, that is the kind of approach that is in some sense symmetrical as is usually accepted in international relations. No condition of Russian citizenship has yet been formed. And it is quite clear that citizenship will in general not be national for we are moving to break down national barriers and create a normal, civilized state in which citizenship does not have any national inflection. It is the same in Russia.... For it is not a state of Russians—there are dozens of other nationalities there. So the process of forming citizenship is under way both there and here, and this has been reflected in the negotiations.

In general, of course, it all comes down to the problem of trust. A certain lack of trust has taken shape, been formed on both sides. This is to be regretted. But it is precisely now, during the course of the negotiations, that with the help of the conclusion of a treaty this tradition may be broken.

What have we seen up to now? For Estonians, and indeed for Russians living in Estonia, the concepts "Union" and "Soviet power" and "Russian" and "pertaining to Russia" have always been confused.

Among the Russian-speaking deputies in the Supreme Soviet this has remained as a hangover from earlier times. For example, it has affected the leading role of the communist faction. And what is happening in the Russian legislature? There it can be clearly seen that a process of pluralization is taking place and different viewpoints are being expressed. But here this kind of pluralism of opinion does not exist among the Russian-speaking deputies, even though diversity of viewpoint and position would be a kind of guarantee of true representation for the Russian-speaking population and for dialogue between the deputies. You see, this kind of diversity of opinion and position does exist among the Estonians.

To the point, the conversation that we had later in the Council of Elders with the participation of the Russian faction, with A. Labasov and P. Grigoryev for example, showed that essentially it is possible to talk not at the level of statements and declarations but at the level of personal contacts, the meeting of opinions, and agreement of positions. I would say that what has happened since the closed session has also demonstrated that in the future a different approach is possible in all our relations in the parliament. The more so since there is already normal cooperation in our committees and commissions.

In general it must be said that the processes must mature. We must become accustomed to this. We must understand it. And we very much hope that as a result of the maturation of these processes extremism will decline and we shall arrive at the kind of community and society in Estonia in which all elements of stress, fear, and distrust will have been overcome.

In this connection I would like also to remind you of the resentments of the Russian-speaking population regarding the various kinds of qualifications. I could say, for example, that all these decisions are the result of firsthand experience. And here we should also remember the Russian proverb: "Practice makes perfect." In fact, how is the decision on a 25-year qualification in Tallinn with respect to apartments democratic? Incidentally, I would say that this will lead to a situation in which Tallinn may become a city of pensioners. All our soviets are still young, and they often make ill-considered decisions. In general a search is under way and there may be mistakes. But there is no need to build total distrust on this....

[Kuznetsova] Nevertheless.... What is the purpose of the treaty? What is its nature—political or economic?

[Lauristin] The treaty is political, of course. But it is a framework treaty. Economic agreements are being concluded in parallel. Incidentally, M. Bronshteyn and other economists are included among the experts. The economic part of this treaty is only a repetition of the general principles that are being realized in the economic agreement.

The general purpose of the treaty is to lay the foundation for the development of relations between the Estonian Republic and Russia on the basis of equal sovereignty and mutual cooperation. It must be followed by more detailed, separate agreements on problems of mutual interest, including for example problems relating to safeguarding the rights of citizens of the two sides, problems of economic mutual relations, and so forth. Everything is still open.... For in Russia they have only just started the process of renewal. At present it is difficult even to predict what changes may take place there or what problems we shall jointly encounter.

[Kuznetsova] And how do you assess the course of the negotiations? And their possible results? What will it give the republic and its population, including the non-indigenous population?

[Lauristin] I would assess them as something quite new. There has been nothing like it in our previous relations. It has been, in fact, a meeting of equal representatives. We did not have any sense of disdain or attempts to apply any kind of pressure, or that it was some kind of great-power approach on Russia's part. And the fears of the Estonians were also explicable: This "big neighbor" has for decades, even centuries, often been a source of pressure. But this was a meeting with the new Russia, with the Russia of the future. We noted this with great satisfaction. And it was also important for the Russians, for in this treaty they are also affirming the new Russia.

What has it given us? First, a calmer situation for future development on both the political and the economic planes.... Up to now there has been a great deal of speculation that "the door would be slammed shut" and communication between Estonia and Russia cut off. But the treaty has left the door open—in all respects....

This is also important for our relations with the West for there has also been distrust there: Suddenly the door to Russia would slam shut and Estonian's partners in the West would be the losers. The treaty is also a kind of guarantee for Western partners who see Estonia as a bridge to the market in the East.

As far as its purely political meaning is concerned, it should be underscored that the treaty, which will be concluded for 10 years, is important in any sudden turn of events. For Estonia everything is clear: We are moving toward state independence. But in Russia these processes are only just beginning.... Will Russia establish a Russian state? In what forms? What kinds of relations will it have with the regions that are now part of the Soviet Union? We can only guess at that now.... But the treaty will give us 10 years of assurance that in any case our relations with our neighbor to the East will be built on a foundation of cooperation, respect, and guarantees of mutual sovereignty.

[Kuznetsova] The Russian-speaking population is particularly concerned about the question of rights and citizenship.

[Lauristin] I would like to say that the text of the treaty, if it is concluded, and we believe that it will be, is to be published in the press. And everyone will see what it contains and what it does not. And then it will be possible to talk more specifically....

[Kuznetsova] Does this mean that you believe that there are no reasons for misgivings?

[Lauristin] I do not think that there are.

Narva Protests Estonian 'Economic Border'

91UN0098B Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA in Russian 5 Oct 90 p 1

[Report by ESTONIAN TELEGRAPH AGENCY correspondent Ye. Kapov: "Narva—Against the Economic Border"]

[Text] Narva, 4 October—A session of the Narva City Soviet of People's Deputies convened here today and discussed the question of the Estonian Republic draft law "On an Economic Border." Estonian Republic Supreme Soviet deputies Vladimir Malkovskiy and Nikolay Zolin addressed the session, providing information on this subject.

During the course of discussion city soviet deputies stated that, as a result of decisions and laws adopted by the Supreme Soviet and the republic government on language, on changing the status of Estonia, on partial revival of the 1938 constitution of the bourgeois republic, on immigration, on privatization of housing, on increasing prices, on ownership, and finally as a result of the law on an economic border, a situation has taken shape in which the non-Estonian population of the republic—including Narva—is being placed under conditions of severe discrimination.

The adoption by the Estonian Supreme Soviet in unilateral fashion of a law on an economic border entails not simply the establishment of customs procedures, speakers asserted, but the closing in fact of the republic's state border. This will result in the severance of historically fashioned economic, social, cultural, ethnic, and kinship ties; and will inflict moral and material damage both on the city as a whole as well as upon each Narva resident individually. It will lower the level of social services provided the residents of Narva and Ivangorod. Additionally, the situation is exacerbated by the fact that in the Estonian Republic itself; questions of protecting the rights of the nonindigenous population and citizenry have not been resolved; mutual relations with the USSR and the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] are not settled.

Proceeding from this, the session of the Narva City Soviet of People's Deputies has adopted the following resolution:

1. To propose to the Estonian Supreme Soviet that it remove the Law on an Economic Border from discussion. In the event the Law on an Economic Border is

adopted, to consider impossible its application and practical execution on the territory that falls under jurisdiction of the Narva City Soviet.

2. To adopt an appeal to the Supreme Soviets of the USSR, RSFSR, and Estonia; to the Leningrad City Soviet, Leningrad Oblast Soviet, and the population of the cities of Narva, Kohtla-Jarve, Sillamyae, Ivangorod, and Kingiseppa; and the settlement of Narva-Yyesuu.

3. To prohibit the Narva City Executive Committee [ispolkom], and in particular the department of internal affairs, from assisting in the creation of any formations, services, or institutions whatsoever intended to execute the Law on an Economic Border for Estonia, or designed to move or change the border between Estonia and the RSFSR.

With the aim of avoiding possible incidents, the department of internal affairs must not permit the emergence of militarized or other formations on territory within the city soviet jurisdiction without the consent of the city soviet.

In matters of safeguarding internal order and protecting the population, enterprises, and city territory; to subordinate the department of internal affairs entirely to the Narva City Soviet in the person of the chairman of the city soviet.

4. To create an operational staff headquarters for protection of the city under the Narva City Soviet of People's Deputies.

4/1. The staff headquarters will conduct necessary measures on city territory to protect the material valuables of citizens, their honor, and their dignity.

4/2. All leaders of enterprises and organizations will strictly execute the demands of the staff headquarters with respect to protecting the population, enterprises, and city territory, and ensuring its provision with food and fuel.

4/3. To confirm V.A. Chuykin, chairman of the Narva City Soviet, as chief of the staff headquarters.

5. A state of emergency is declared in the city of Narva at the moment of adoption by the Estonian Supreme Soviet of the Law on an Economic Border.

6. To present to the City Soviets of Kohtla-Jarve, Sillamyae, Ivangorod, and Kingiseppa, and the Narva-Yyesuu Settlement Soviet, a request to render assistance in providing a mutual defense of the territories.

7. The city ispolkom will develop jointly with city soviet commissions the conditions and procedure for conducting a peaceful referendum on the future status of the city, which will ensure protection of the interests and civil rights of its residents. Such conditions and procedure will be submitted for confirmation by the city soviet prior to 12 October.

8. The chairman of the city soviet and the city ispolkom will accomplish additional measures for maintaining and improving ties between Narva and Leningrad, and Leningrad Oblast, and will provide the necessary stability for these ties.

9. To propose that the Supreme Soviets of Estonia and the RSFSR review matters that affect the interests of the residents of Narva and Ivangorod as an integral social complex.

10. To appeal to residents of Narva, Ivangorod, Kingiseppa, Kohtla-Jarve, and Sillamyae, and of the settlement of Narva-Yyessu, with the request that they participate in actions of protest against the establishment of a border between Estonia and the RSFSR, which is planned for 13 October.

This decision of the Fifth Session of the Narva City Soviet of People's Deputies will be sent to the USSR president and to the RSFSR Supreme Soviet.

Authors of IME Plan View Impact, Future of Plan

914A0033A Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA in Russian 28 Sep 90 p 2

[Report on interview with T. Made, S. Kallas, and M. Titma, authors of the IME plan, by R. Rihvi; place and date not given: "IME Was Born Three Years Ago"]

[Text] 26 September 1987 was a Saturday, and on this day the newspaper EDAZI published a proposal by four authors concerning economic accountability for the economy of Estonia. The article was signed by Edgar Savisaar, Siim Kallas, Tiit Made, and Mikk Titma.

The authors had far-reaching plans in mind when speaking about economic accountability for Estonia. An emergency meeting of the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau was convened on the very next day, a Sunday. Punitive measures did not follow, but public thought was agitated.

Today we are speaking with three of the four authors of the plan—Tiit Made, Siim Kallas, and Mikk Titma. This is how they answered our questions.

[Rihvi] We are aware that the mechanism of IME [Self-Managing Estonia] was supposed to go into action on 1 January of this year. Even six months ago the ideas of IME were very timely. Today there is silence about them. Please comment on this.

[Titma] It is to be expected that people are no longer talking about IME. IME was a child of its times, and its main essence was political. The plan was a way of raising the problems of independence and the sovereignty of Estonia without taking a clear opposition stance. Today when the Estonian National Independence Party tries to elevate its own role in the events that took place to an absolute, it violates the true proportions of the processes. A legal opposition was the form necessary to repair society. There was also a clear—with respect to the

regime—opposing force embodied in the Estonian National Independence Party. Compared to it, representatives of a legal opposition were still able to achieve much. The IME plan contributed to this. We could not be directly accused of nationalism and antistate activities. It was necessary to begin a dialogue with us. The party leadership existing at that time was not capable of that. Pushing the IME plan on it, we achieved the next step which had become possible. This became the creation of the People's Front.

[Kallas] I said earlier that for me this was not a fight for some specific result; it was the push for new processes that was important. It is impossible to aspire to economic accountability for the Republic of Estonia. Economic accountability is impossible in principle. But by expressing the idea, we achieved the inclusion of new processes in society. This is what is valuable.

Our proposal achieved its goal. When working out succeeding plans, many words were wasted on the description of final goals. I was against this, and as a member of a working group at the Institute of Economics, which I had joined, I tried more to focus attention on that economic mechanism which would permit us to change existing relations and not to concentrate only on final results.

Why does no one talk about IME now? The processes are under way; IME was more or less camouflage. Many people understood that in fact the fight for independence was beginning. At the same time it was concealed by economic ideas; today there is no need for camouflage. Those principles that were worked out in the process of crystallizing the idea are today being realized in real life. It is another question to ask whether they are being realized well or poorly.

[Made] IME originated in disputes. I personally was not a member of the council on the problems of economic accountability for Estonia. The council set a goal of developing a mass of documents. As life has demonstrated, for the most part this work was simply a waste of time. Nonetheless, it helped raise the level of economic knowledge of the people, and the principles of a market economy were mastered.

[Rihvi] Could the four of you assemble together again and generate ideas that could excite public thought anew and raise it to a new level?

[Titma] At that time our act had a political sense—who would dare to sign the document. The particular provisions of the document itself were not as important as the very idea that economic accountability is a program that is able to move society forward. Many people supported that idea back then but they were not prepared to take the risk. As a result, only four signatures were at the end of the text.

The number of people spreading the idea itself was quite wide in Estonia. The propaganda is still being conducted today. We four people, as the exponents of the idea, are not a unique phenomenon in society. At that time the essence of it was in the readiness to take the risk and take responsibility upon oneself.

Our personal relations should not be misinterpreted. We are all different, and each has his own nature. Of course we each went our own ways after such a political act. Formerly, I often bumped into Savisaar. I only met Made at the time we signed the document. My contacts with Kallas were casual. A false impression arose that we all sat together and concocted the ideas among ourselves. The ideas were in the air, and the only question was who would risk his political welfare by expressing the idea of IME publicly.

[Kallas] Lately I have heard the suggestion that we again return to the sources of the process. I am not opposed, if it is necessary and it will help society overcome the schism. There is another question: Is there a need for such cooperation?

[Made] I do not believe that this is basically possible inasmuch as the team only came together for a certain time, made a certain effort, and separated. Life has gone forward, and today I only collaborate with Siim Kallas as an economist. But if the situation becomes hopeless, apparently we will have to assemble and think about how to pull ourselves from the chaos. I still have a store of ideas. And although I presently do not see any opportunity for the four of us to collaborate, nothing can be excluded. Life is so changeable. We are different people, and we cannot subjugate ourselves to one another—there can only be friendly relations between us. As soon as someone begins to demonstrate his own superiority, the rest begin to feel a sense of protest.

[Rihvi] What kind of documents and what kind of strategy does the society of Estonia need today to move forward?

[Made] No new proposals are needed. Everything has already been said clearly: Free enterprise, a market economy, private initiative, independent conduct of one's own affairs, and secession from the Union. At present it is necessary to create conditions so that we may begin to act. To conduct negotiations and consultations and to prepare elements of the new society able to function actively in the future. It is absolutely clear that it would be impossible to implement IME before independence is achieved.

[Titma] The idea of IME has exhausted itself. As a scholar and a man who is no longer young, I am alarmed at the possibility of developing society in accordance with gloomy scenarios. In our country the optimists who view life in rosy hues occur mostly among the youth and young politicians; they depict a splendid future. But the most dangerous thing is that we are not prepared for a scenario in which our economy moves to world market prices. At the very instant that such a scenario happens, our fuel and raw materials will be exhausted, we will no longer have the goods that we are accustomed to consuming, and there will not be anywhere to sell our own

goods. I am alarmed by the fact that we are not trying to prepare for such a development strategically and as a state. I cite agriculture as an example. I was one of the first to begin talking about the need to move to farmstead methods of management. I still have not lost enthusiasm and believe that the process must begin. But if I were in the position of leader of the economy and saw how society scoffs at these forms, I would abandon large-scale production and split up the money among the workers. This is exactly what is happening on many farms. The result is that one-third of the livestock has been slaughtered and the pigpens are empty. What will happen when our sole hard currency—agricultural production—is exhausted? With what will we buy oil from Russia?

Latvian Government Leaders Meet With Shevardnadze

LD2410082990 Riga Domestic Service in Latvian 0530 GMT 24 Oct 90

[Text] Yesterday evening in Moscow, at the initiative of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Latvia, the head of the Republic's government, Ivars Godmanis; Minister of Foreign Affairs Janis Jurkans; and Chairman of the Foreign Affairs Commission of the Supreme Council of Latvia Mavriks Vulfsons met USSR Minister of Foreign Affairs Eduard Shevardnadze.

In the talks our representatives expounded a Latvian foreign policy directed toward full restoration of state independence and exemplified by the recent foreign policy activities of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Latvia.

The representatives of Latvia advanced the question of probable participation by a delegation of the Republic of Latvia in the Paris summit meeting of the security and cooperation in Europe process in the second half of November. Questions of mutual relations and the possibilities of cooperation between the ministries of foreign affairs of Latvia and the USSR were also analyzed.

The representatives in Moscow of the Council of Ministers of Latvia, Janis Peters, participated in the talks.

Latvia Alters Constitutional Voting Article

LD2310204190 Riga Domestic Service in Latvian 1830 GMT 23 Oct 90

[Text] The Supreme Council today adopted a law which alters the article in the Constitution on the quorum of a sitting of the parliament, how laws [and] resolutions are adopted, but especially how the Constitution itself can be altered. Previously a majority of the votes of all the deputies was necessary. Now a majority of the deputies who vote (?is necessary), with the provision that it must be not less than half the total number of deputies. Correspondingly, the Supreme Council can adopt laws and resolutions by a majority of votes as long as it is not less than a third of the total number of deputies.

Today the Supreme Council also adopted changes to the Constitution on property, on procurator's supervision, and on changing the name of the town and rayon of Stucka—it has been renamed Aizkraukle Rayon. The law on amnesty was adopted and takes effect today.

At the initiative of the people of Liepaja a resolution was adopted to allow the Liepaja Council of People's Deputies to entrust the leadership of the self-government to the city board and to elect the head of this board.

Furthermore, a resolution was adopted today on the USSR people's deputies from Latvia. It lays down that these deputies cannot represent the Republic of Latvia without special authorization and that they must not simultaneously hold positions in the leadership or government structures of the USSR and also of the Republic of Latvia.

Latvian Constitutional Amendments Reported

LD2310222990 Moscow TASS in English 2202 GMT 23 Oct 90

[By TASS correspondent Valeriy Zaitsev]

[Text] Riga October 23 TASS—The Latvian parliament on Tuesday endorsed amendments to the republican constitution with an edge of one vote. The amendments were adopted on the insistence of the Popular Front Group.

Bills and resolutions of the Latvian Supreme Soviet can now be passed if the majority of people's deputies participating in a vote cast their votes in favour. The vote requires the presence of at least one third of all deputies in parliament.

Considering that there are 200 deputies in the present Latvian parliament, the passage of legislative acts requires a vote in favour by only 34 deputies. Starting on Tuesday, amendments to the constitution can be made "by the majority of at least two thirds from the number of deputies participating in a vote if this majority exceeds half of the overall number".

The opposition group Ravnopraviye (Equality), which numbers 59 deputies, is actually denied even a theoretical possibility to influence the parliament's activity.

Deputy Valdis Berklavs, a leader of the movement for the national independence of Latvia, said during the discussion of the bill that "those who will vote against, should have no seat in our parliament."

According to Ravnopraviye group leader Sergey Dimanis, the priority of anti-democratic methods of law making has now been established in the Latvian Supreme Soviet, a step was taken towards strengthening radical forces and unacceptance of dissent. He said opposition deputies were forced to ask the Soviet president and the international community for help to prevent the creation of an authoratiarian mononational rule in Latvia.

RSFSR

Coverage of RSFSR Supreme Soviet Proceedings

23 October Session Reported

LD2410111390

[Editorial report] Moscow Television service in Russian at 1947 GMT on 23 October carries a 64-minute account of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet session in the Kremlin on 23 October.

The session opens with a speech by RSFSR First Vice President Ruslan Khasbulatov on economic planning.

Next the program announcer introduces a draft law on applying the laws of the USSR on Russian territory which was presented by Sergey Mikhaylovich Shakhray, head of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Committee on Legislation.

Shakhray outlines the three main issues to be raised in debating this draft. First, why was such a law is now required; second, is it right to talk about the primacy of RSFSR legislation over USSR law; and third, do Union bodies have the right to revoke, suspend, or deem invalid any RSFSR law, including the draft now being debated.

He continues: "The answer to the first question is: The USSR Supreme Soviet has adopted an important and on the whole positive document in the Basic Guidelines for Stabilization of the Economy and the Transition to the Market. However, the attempts to merge the unmergeable—the Ryzhkov program and the Gorbachev-Yeltsin program—have reached such heights of abstraction that it would be possible within the framework of implementing this program to implement the Ryzhkov program, to achieve nothing while talking about implementing the Gorbachev-Yeltsin program. Under those conditions everything would be decided by command, command guiding the implementation of the Basic Guidelines, and that command is just as before coming from the Ryzhkov government.

"The new body—the Interrepublican Economic Committee—is much needed in principle. It is not replacing the USSR Council of Ministers but working alongside existing bodies. Judge for yourselves: we have the USSR Congress of People's Deputies, the USSR Supreme Soviet, the USSR President, the Presidential Council, the Council of the Federation, the Council of Ministers, the Interrepublican Economic Committee... this list could go on. Is this number of bodies, which duplicate each other, able to take decisions in the emergency situation our economy finds itself in urgently and effectively? So what is the solution—the same height of abstraction again. That is one aspect.

"Another aspect is that the Basic Guidelines envisage, in inverted commas, handing over to the Union republics a proportion of the foreign debt, a proportion of the budget deficit, handing over the social programs, and naturally responsibility for their implementation. However the resources, finances, and hard currency all stay with the center. In other words, the responsibility and debts are being divided among the republics while the real power remains exclusively with the center. Under these conditions it is essential that there be machinery to protect the RSFSR against decisions coming from the center which run counter to the interests of the peoples of Russia, undermining the foundations of the sovereignty of the RSFSR."

Shakhray explains that it is juridically correct to talk about the primacy of RSFSR legislation over Union law following the declaration of sovereignty, and that this is entirely in line with the provisions of the original 1922 Treaty of Union. He compares the Union to a child who has stopped obeying its parents, no longer doing what it was intended for. The constituent republics have therefore taken back the functions they had delegated to the Union.

Shakhray continues: "Having adopted at our first congress a decision on demarcation of functions, we said that we needed the Union. We hand over to them specific areas—defense, security, space, power engineering, and so on. In those areas we are leaving a number of rights to the Union, considering that it performs them better. In those areas presidential decrees and USSR laws are immediately valid throughout the RSFSR without any endorsement or ratification. On other matters which we are retaining for ourselves—for example regulating property rights—on these matters it is logical that there should be no Union laws or decrees. However, should they appear it would be right that they should have to be given the go ahead by the Union republic. We should not have to run after every decree, decision, and law from the center. The republic states that this is a protective mechanism. If the Union continues passing laws and decrees affecting those areas which fall under the competence of the republic, these cannot be valid save by advance agreement with the RSFSR."

Shakhray answers his third question by saying that Article 108 of the USSR Constitution states that the center does not have the right to revoke republican legislation. Presidential decrees and decisions of the USSR Supreme Soviet declaring the legislation of the Union republics invalid are therefore not constitutional and themselves invalid.

He continues: "In previous years the USSR was formally in law a state structure with elements of a confederation and the right of free secession. While it remains essentially a centralized force, a unitary state, it is now in reality on a federal basis. There are even aspects of international law in the relationship between the Union republics and the center. The news of the last few days is evidence of that. Therefore in this situation attempted duress represents the past in terms of constitutional law. This could only lead to confrontation. There can only be

one way out on the basis of the existing USSR Constitution: the center can, in accordance with the laws of the republics, make its own laws but in only one way, by reconciling the positions of the centre and the union republics.

"The draft law being submitted to you is an essential measure to protect the RSFSR against unfounded decisions from the center. It is ultimately a measure to defend the sovereignty of the RSFSR.

"In Article One you can see that the powers we are handing over to the center and laws of USSR bodies on these matters are immediately valid throughout the RSFSR. That is, we are fixing the range of issues. Part Two of Article One makes the reservation that should a decision, which for example undermines the basis of the economic sovereignty of Russia, be taken on any of the delegated issue—for example concerning resources, gold or diamonds—here the republic would retain the right to suspend the decision and propose to the union bodies that this matter be reconsidered and dealt with. I would stress the constructive basis of our draft law."

Shakhray reiterates that Union decisions in the delegated areas would be valid immediately in the RSFSR and that central decisions in other areas would require RSFSR endorsement. He adds that the draft law will not act retrospectively—all current legislation will be respected.

He goes on: "It is proposed that all bodies and organizations operating on the territory of the Russian Federation make a choice. Either you operate on the basis of RSFSR laws and USSR laws covering the areas we have delegated to the union or your decisions and deals are deemed invalid. Should you nonetheless take the second course, the course of ignoring the laws of the Russian Federation, Article Five details accountability for this. The fines which are recieved will go into the budget of the relevant local soviet."

Shakhray adds that Article Six determines which bodies are to judge this accountability and proposes that the legislation, once passed, should be immediately effective. He suggests that debate now should concentrate on whether there is a need for this protective machinery, and if it is needed, that article by article debate should ensue.

Questions from the floor follow.

At 2020 GMT Deputy Gleb Yakunin calls on deputies to adopt the draft law, saying people will support it. There are more questions and proposals. Deputy Isakov makes amendments to the draft, then Deputy Katenkov gives his view of the draft. The draft must be adopted together with a mechanism for implementing it so that it does not remain on paper only. Deputy Zadonskiy supports the draft law, but Deputy Zalevskaya says the draft cannot be adopted since they are moving towards confrontation but she is for peaceful solutions. Yeltsin's and Yavlinskiy's statements are provocations. A consensus at the top level is required. A provisional moratorium on declarations of sovereignty would be a good idea because autonomous formations are following Russia's example. Other deputies speak against the draft. Finally Khasbulatov reads an amended draft, followed by a long discussion follows. The issue is postponed until the next session.

At 2041 GMT Yuriy Skokov presents a draft on economic relations in 1991. The old system of state order has been preserved. Enterprises are begging to become masters of their output. The purpose of the draft is to assist enterprises in transition to the market. The draft is adopted at the evening session.

Deputy Alekseyev makes a statement. Relatives and parents of those who died in the army in peaceful times in the USSR are sent an appeal which Alekseyev reads. Nobody bears responsibility for these crimes. The military do not want to know. A list of demands follows, including assistance to the parents of those who died and bringing criminal charges against the culprits. Mothers are threatening to start a hunger strike and to occupy Red Square on the October Day.

At 2051 GMT the session is declared closed.

Khasbulatov Speech

LD2410082590 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1947 GMT 23 Oct 90

[Remarks by Ruslan Khasbulatov, Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic (RSFSR) Supreme Soviet first vice president, at the RSFSR Supreme Soviet session in the Kremlin on 23 October; from the "RSFSR Supreme Soviet Diary" program—recorded]

[Text] Permit me to draw your attention for literally five minutes to what the congress has instructed me to do so that I can express some ideas, especially concerning our tactics and policy, and to see to what extent this qualitatively new situation affects our previous program provisions and all our activities. Questions are quite fairly and justifiably being asked about whether this new situation signifies that we have spent a lot of time in vain and perhaps adopted the wrong documents and proposed the wrong bills. So of course no doubt we need to realize what is happening, especially in light of the two speeches by our RSFSR Supreme Soviet chairman and the president of the country. To a significant degree his speech was not so much an analysis of precisely the market program as an assessment of what the Russian Supreme Soviet chairman said.

I must tell you frankly my own subjective reaction. I was extremely surprised by the president's tone and interpretation of the Supreme Soviet chairman's speech. I was surprised by the fact that the very important ideas in our chairman's speech were left aside. Together with a profound and primarily economic analysis of the situation, a way to cooperation was clearly offered, an appeal to cooperation. And this very serious, businesslike, and

very constructive appeal was left somewhere aside in the president's speech. All his attention went into a statement on the divergences and an analysis focused on those assistants and petty assistants, on who and what let that side down, and so on.

I must say plainly that in this part I got the impression that this was no longer a speech by a major statesman and politician but a secretary of an oblast committee or kray committee. [applause]

I think that given the contemporary situation, when the destiny of the fatherland depends on our decisions and activities—and in the course of five and a half years the central government nevertheless conducted things toward the ruin of our economy—we cannot permit ourselves such emotional means as the president permitted himself. We must renounce such arrogant speeches. What a lecture! I would like to draw your attention to the fact that the president has never permitted himself to speak like that to a single Union leader, not a single Union leader.

It is natural that such a speech introduces very serious discord to our attempts to consolidate ranks. It arouses people's discontent. Here are more telegrams which Boris Mikhaylovich Isayev is showing, saying how can it be that these sufficiently constructive proposals from the chairman are coming up against not only incomprehension but some kind of mocking attitude. I think that here we should have a precise position. It should be a clear position. We really... here a comrade deputy has prompted us to think, and I believe many people share his opinion that the USSR Supreme Soviet's adotion of the Main Direction program does not close the road to either cooperation or to implementing our program guidelines. We simply need to very quickly come to grips with this situation and make substantial adjustments to it.

In connection with this I would like to draw your attention to the really serious changes in that chapter, if you remember the Shatalin program's point of departure, because all these reformation proceses are synchronized in the republics, and in the center it has been necessary to deeply strengthen the center's economic function, particularly that of the president. This was perfectly justified. Representatives of the Union republics who took part in the development of this program have consciously embarked on limiting the rights of their republics in this sphere by voluntarily agreeing to hand over these powers.

But now the situation has changed. What has been written in the General Directions? The main weight of the reforms falls on the republics, on the republics. Therefore the center needs to consolidate the position of the republics, give more resources to the republics, more opportunities. Therefore the center concept is changing. The main weight of the government power is well as economic functions falls on the republics. Therefore the policy of the center which we were witnessing, and which as it happened the Supreme Soviet chairman noted, is connected with the attempt to concentrate all economic power under itself and should be re-examined in a most thorough way.

So we should generally doubt the adoption of the presidential economic decrees and directives on principle. If they are to be adopted they should be coordinated with all the Union republics unconditionally. Without this, even these General Directions will not be successful. We will have utter chaos on our hands if on the one side the responsibility for the reform is being transferred to the Union republics but the center keeps the right to adopt all economic decisions. This is absurd. There should be some logic inherent in any economic program. This is the problem.

The next matter I would like to point out is that attempts to blame us for trying to shift our responsibility on to somebody else are completely unjustified. On the contrary, by strengthening our cooperation with the president, by thinking that the president should function above the nationalitites' level as the reconciliator, we—as you yourselves have noted when I am chairing the sessions—are always making a point to demonstrate our respectful attitude toward the president. And we have a very clear line here—to detach the main responsibility for the economic failures between the president and the executive power. I personally think that there is a very constructive point in this, a very healthy principle. But because the president has seen otherwise a different situation is developing now.

This means the president is taking the responsibility himself for all these failures during the last five and a half years, from April 1985. And during those famous stagnating times matters were not so bad in the economy—you know this as well as I do—and to blame all the difficulties on somewhere back in the seventies is an illusion. We are talking only about incompetent policy, about an economic line which could not be justified, for which naturally people demand someone to be made responsible. We wanted to take this responsibility upon ourselves, totally. Now we too want to take it upon ourselves. The only thing we are asking for: Let us not interfere. Let us solve this problem together.

The third matter. If you read the newspapers these days you will find that the USSR Bank has been created, it seems the Russian Bank. I mean, the center is creating an enormous number of such associations, organizations, and enterprises, thus kicking the ground from under our feet. The Supreme Soviet chairman spoke about this in his address. But the center will not create a Lithuanian bank, a Georgian bank, a Belorussian bank. Have you noticed? The specifics are such that the center has practically accepted that it no longer has power in the Union republics. But it tries to introduce things here with still more persistence, what comes out is a practically competitive economic policy.

Well, have a look at this introduction of enterprises. What is it? It is the inculcating of bureaucratic bourgeoisie. In a number of cases we already have to face a situation when former ministers or their successors say: It is our property. Even in Moscow we are not getting very far with buildings. In general, things which Boris Nikolayevich spoke about on a large scale are based on well-defined and clear-cut facts. Only they are given in a theoretical summary. There is nothing new here.

Nevertheless I spoke to the chairman yesterday evening and he is absolutely determined to get rid of all confrontational points in our work. We do not have the right to deal with such things today. We really have to—if not all together, taking account of interests, each other's interests—follow the line of deepening of our reforms.

On this I would like to remind you of the most important thing nowadays. All these programs aside, the main thing for us is to adopt the most serious and responsible economic decisions. What sort of economic decisions? This way or another, whatever these programs are, they have one thing in common—movement toward a combined economy, movement toward the market. The only way that leads there is the adoption of really radical solutions, laws, decisions, enforceable enactments of other kinds, governmental directives. That is why if you look at it from these positions, none of our decisions are erroneous or superfluous, not even one. That is why it would not be very fair ourselves to start saying now: well, the nature of our activiites and laws should be changed. That is why deepening this economic reform implies the competent, clear-cut, and urgent execution of legislative drafts and their implementation through the Supreme Soviet.

The second thing is preparations for our extraordinary congress which will approve or disapprove—let us hope that it will approve—our agrarian policy which naturally has to be implemented immediately.

And the third thing, the most important thing I think, maybe even more important then the first two, is executive activities, the executive and managerial activities of the government. Well we see that having taken various people we have formed a youthful government. But we have to provide serious help for the government. Here we have a lot of problems. Last time we talked and I criticized—I would not like to talk about it again—but Deputy Filatov was absolutely right to have stressed that it looks like it is possible to set up our deputies' commission—this matter has already been raised here—to examine the situation with foodstuffs and to make it incumbent upon this commission to investigate this matter at least in Moscow, for example, and to ask bodies of the soviet power and law enforcement bodies to investigate this matter. We undoubtedly have to tackle these specific tasks and issues without being destructive and dealing only with our fundmental legislation.

Well in general esteemed comrades deputies, it looks like a short discussion is going to take place now. I would like to ask you to be fairly cautious in your speeches regardless of the clear-cut analysis of this situation and the general and correct view of this problem so that we do not give anyone an opportunity to reproach us for aggravating the situation, for not seeing the problem correctly, and so on and so forth.

One thing is clear. During our meetings with electors we have to realize very clearly that the main aims of our 500 days program cannot be cast aside. There can be various stages here. The nature of work within the framework of these stages can vary and there can be several opportunities. But why do we need such a program, no matter what we call it? Because it is directed at real improvements in people's positions, and moreover within a specific period of time.

I think that given all the changes in policy guidelines within the program itself, our aim is to achieve essential improvements in people's positions within a year and a half, within these 500 days. This aim should be a guideline for every deputy, for every deputy. Objective or subjective circumstances can not be taken into account. If we are really executing the will of our peoples, if we were elected by them for these very aims, we have to be strong and capable in order to resolve this major problem—the main thing our people are concerned about, our people who have been brought to the brink of despair because of ludicrous attempts to govern from above.

Control By Center Criticized

PM2410091990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Oct 90 Second Edition p 2

[Report by V. Izgarshev on 23 October proceedings at RSFSR Supreme Soviet session: "No to Confrontations"]

[Excerpts] At a joint session of the chambers yesterday the Russian Supreme Soviet discussed what one of the deputies defined as the first law resulting from the declaration on the republic's sovereignty adopted by the First Congress of People's Deputies. The draft law in question is designed to regulate relations with legislative acts by the Union center.

Against tradition, there was no discussion of "any other business" at the session. Some deputies stated that voters cannot understand or accept what is being done in this hall. B. Yeltsin and M. Gorbachev have made speeches, and G. Yavlinskiy has made his statement. There is a food shortage in the country. But not a word about any of this is to be heard from this hall.

R. Khasbulatov, who was chairing the session, agreed with this. He made a brief statement. Deputies decided that it should be published in full in the press and carried on television, along with S. Shakhray's report on the agenda.

The RSFSR first deputy chairman's speech stressed the concern in connection with the complications that have

emerged in the interrelationship between the Russian leadership and the center. [passage ommited]

Specific proposals were then made about future actions by Russian legislators and the government aimed at solving the economic problems in the republic.

The people's deputies then started discussing the agenda.

Responding to the Russian and Union leaders' speeches, one newspaper prefaced its comment a few days ago with the acerbic headline: "Gorbachev-Yeltsin: Honeymoon Ends in Divorce."

Unfortunately some people's deputies it seems to me took these words as the text for their speeches. A pity indeed! We should be moving away from confrontations, of which our life is alas full, to cooperation and mutual understanding.

Yeltsin Discusses RSFSR-Moldavia Treaty

91UN0102A Kishinev MOLDOVA SUVERANA in Russian 29 Sep 90 p 4

[MOLDOVA-PRES AGENCY report on interview with B.N. Yeltsin, chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, by Moldavian television commentator G. Myrzenko; place and date of interview not given]

[Text] **The media are receiving a multitude of questions from readers: When and how will it be possible to familiarize ourselves with the full transcript of the interview that B.N. Yeltsin gave a correspondent of Moldovan [Moldavia] television?**

With the permission of the interviewer, national television commentator G. Myrzenko, MOLDOVA-PRES AGENCY makes this interview available to the republic's newspapers.

[Myrzenko] Boris Nikolayevich, how do you assess the significance of this treaty?

[Yeltsin] We have today signed the second treaty since the proclamation of our sovereignty. The first was signed in conjunction with Georgia, but was not however of such dimensions and provides mainly for economic and cultural cooperation. However, this treaty is more all-embracing and incorporates political questions—and of course economic and S&T questions, trade, national, interethnic, cultural and sociocultural policy and so forth—that is, all aspects of our life. This is our future path, I believe. I have my doubts about the very rapid signing of a Union treaty inasmuch as quite a few versions have been received from almost every republic. In addition, each republic has proclaimed its own state sovereignty. This has to be taken into account. Whoever might still somehow now be trying to console himself with the fact that they have allegedly decided to play at legislatures is making a flagrant political mistake. This is very serious. In connection with the intensification of democratization, the national self-awareness of the peoples has grown, and the republics naturally want to be independent. After all, for so many years they have been downtrodden, lacking their own voice and power! In demolishing the vertical pivot of supercentralization and supermonopolization in everything—politics, economics, the social sphere and so forth—we are moving toward horizontal relations: republic with republic, oblast with oblast, enterprise with enterprise. This is the truest path. In this way our market to which we are now switching will gradually take shape, because if the market is shaped basically by various edicts and decrees from above, as envisaged in the government program, this will be useless; we have already wasted 73 years on this. You can see to what we have come. For this reason the leadership of our Supreme Soviet, Comrade Silayev, chairman of the Council of Ministers, and the comrades who took part in the conclusion of the treaty attach immense significance to this document. We are sure that it will give a boost to our republics' further development and reveal new potential in an extension of bilateral relations.

[Myrzenko] Boris Nikolayevich, you have already partly answered the second question I wish to ask you—concerning your attitude toward yesterday's speech by M. Gorbachev in the USSR Supreme Soviet, in which he sharply criticized the Moldavian lawmakers, thereby approving legal nihilism, and at the same time said not a word of condemnation of the actions of the separatists.

[Yeltsin] This was not the president's first mistake, I believe, particularly on questions of attitude toward the republics—sovereign states that have declared themselves such legitimately. To say that this was not an ethical speech is to understate the case. We view his words as conveying his attitude toward our sovereignty which may be categorized as just as unethical and totally without foundation. For this reason our Supreme Soviet is currently considering the question of the adoption of a statement apropos such pronouncements by the president. We must not permit such an attitude toward a sovereign state when unjustified accusations are showered on it. This does not soothe, but on the contrary ignites passions and national and interethnic discord. On the other hand, by our treaty we are today binding our friendship and cooperation. We declare that we will together afford assurances of social protection for Moldovans who live on our Russian soil, and simultaneously for Russians who live in the Republic of Moldova. People should feel confident that they are protected. This is very important in order for them to feel at ease where they live.

[Myrzenko] But I would like to tell you in this respect that your call for your compatriots to return to Russia has met with a sharply negative response. Even certain Russian-speaking media, from the separatist areas particularly, are in this connection reporting your low standing among this part of the population. What would you say to them were you to speak to them directly?

[Yeltsin] I will not allude to my standing in the country in general and in Russia in particular. I will say merely

that some people are for inappropriate political ends using an incorrect interpretation of what I was speaking about. I was saying that if compatriots living abroad in any country or in the Union republics wanted for some reason or other—if they have the desire and need—to return to Russian soil, Russians would accept them and would adopt all measures to create the appropriate conditions for them to be able to work and live and for them to be able to have their own land and other property, if they wanted. We will enact such laws. This was how the address, not the call sounded. Not that all 60 million living outside of Russia should come back to Russia. It would have been insanity on my part to have said such a thing. For those who have still not understood what I was speaking about I repeat: Who knows why or under what circumstances my compatriots have come to be outside of the republic. Those who now wish to return—for family reasons, for reunification with their family, military persons cut from the Armed Forces who perhaps also wish to return to the land of their parents—we will not repel, expel or oppose them. **22 September 1990, Moscow**

Yavlinskiy Assesses Economic Reform Prospects

PM2410111190 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 23 Oct 90 p 4

[Article by G. Yavlinskiy, deputy chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers: "500 Days Is Not Enough"]

[Text] What is proposed in the 500 days program does not yet create a developed market economy but brings us very close to it. Who needs to be scared, one wonders? Let me answer: Primarily those who realize that they are doing work that nobody needs. Skilled workers and engineers have nothing to worry about, nor do clever and competent officials....

How soon will all this now happen? When will a new attempt at stabilization be possible and how much will it cost all of us? We need a careful analysis in this area, but given the financial crisis and the shortages, prices will rise and barter trade will expand. In my opinion, the economic situation in the country is defined by three factors. The first is that stabilization will be accompanied by far greater difficulties than is the case at present. The second point is: Will it be possible to coordinate the republics' actions on the new basis—horizontal ties between them will not be enough by themselves? And the third point is: Will the center and the republics be able to create an effective mechanism for administering reform? If political confrontation intensifies, absolutely nothing will result—managed economic reform will be doomed to failure in conditions of political instability. We will know the answers in three or four months' time.

RSFSR Communists' Initiative Congress Held

PM2410142190 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 23 Oct 90 Second Edition p 2

[Report by correspondent A. Molokov: "In Search of an Alternative"]

[Text] Leningrad, 22 Oct—The First Initiative Congress of Russian Communists completed its work late on Sunday evening. Its third state, held in Leningrad 20-21 October, summed up the results of six months of activity by the "left wing of the CPSU," as people are increasingly frequently calling the "initiative movement for the restoration of the Russian Communist Party." Yu. Terentyev, secretary of the party committee of the Leningrad "Arsenal" association and chairman of the Initiative Congress organizational bureau, delivered a report "on the political assessment of the results of the 28th CPSU Congress and the Constituent Congress of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Communist Party." In the report "Contradictions and Alternative for the Soviet economy," Professor A. Sergeyev, member of the CPSU Central Committee, examined critically the plans for a market economy and justified the strategy for the resurrection of Soviet power as the power of the working people.

But the keenest polemics developed around the "Communist program of actions" proposed by the Initiative Movement as an alternative to "the Basic Guidelines for the Activity of the RSFSR Communist Party," published 19 October. On the first day, when the congress was working in 10 sections, over 160 people took part in the discussion. But the discussion erupted with new force when the drafting commission submitted for approval the document which had already been discussed. Two approaches toward this problem clashed. One was defended by Yu. Belov, member of the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee and secretary of the Leningrad CPSU Obkom [Oblast Committee], who stresses that the alternative option for the development of the economy proposed by the initiative movement for all its right to exist is already impossible because society has already entered the market, whether some people like it or not or accept it or reject it. Now only the mechanism for the protection of the working people's rights is needed.

The second approach was defended by V. Tyulkin, secretary of the congress organizational bureau, member of the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee, and secretary of the party committee at the Leningrad "Avangard" association, on behalf of the Initiative Movement. "We are being asked to turn the CPSU into a party of social protection and construction opposition. This thesis would seem to generate no objections. But a whole series of questions immediately arises, and let us put them to ourselves. First: Will there be anyone to do the defending if the present pace of the party's collapse are maintained? Second, against whom should they do their defending? Against their communist comrades who pursue this line in the leadership? And finally, the most

important question: Will the working people entrust the defense of their interests to the party which will lead them to unemployment, capitalization, and perhaps even worse—cataclysms? The party should not be simply a political party of defense. It should be a party of actions."

The third stage of the Initiative Congress included an alternative radical economic reform in the program of actions. The reform is based on retargeting production toward man, toward use value. But it has already become clear to everyone that it can only be implemented on condition that political power is in the hands of the working people.

"The soviets of working people must take power into their hands first at the enterprises, then in the rayons, and then in the cities and oblasts. But we must not overthrow those soviets which exist but go to stand next to them. In other words, a system of two parallel structures should arise—the structure of the power of the producer and the structure of power from the population"—Professor Sergeyev briefly explained the concept of the soviets of working people.

How far is the idea of the working people's committees as the first cells of soviet power at plants and construction sites, on collective farms, and in other collectives a feasible one? We put this question to V.I. Goshin, leader of a mixed team of metal workers at the Nizhegorodskiy "Krasnoye Sormovo" association and a participant in the Initiative Congress.

"I agree with the idea of creating committees of working people! The workers are fed up and are already beginning to lose patience. But it is not strike committees we should organize we should not threaten strikes against—whom? Ourselves?! We should organize workers' committees to manage enterprises. Work not to destroy but to create."

That is the main idea proposed by the Initiative Congress at its concluding stage. The congress, on completing its work, adopted the decision to hold a second Initiative Congress of Russian Communists 20-21 April 1991. It is thus becoming a permanent forum.

Media Committee Views Subscription Decline

PM2310140390 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 23 Oct 90 Second Edition p 2

[Report by TASS legislative correspondents V. Dzhibuti and R. Karyakin: "Things Going Badly for Subscription"]

[Text] Subscription to newspapers and journals in Russia has been 13 percent of last year's level. Over 2,000 of the republic's newspapers are now subsidized. This information as of September—there is no more recent information—was read out 22 October at a seminar held at the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet Committee for the Mass Media.

M.N. Poltoranin, RSFSR Minister of the press and mass media, and V.B. Bulgak, RSFSR Minister for Communications, Information Technology, and Space, delivered speeches.

Twenty rubles [R]—that is the guideline cost of the primer and other textbooks so necessary to children unless their publication is subsidized. In the opinion of the RSFSR minister of the press and the mass media, in connection with the increase in prices for paper and delivery, the total sum of subsidies next year should reach R1 billion. In addition, as of January 1991 it is planned to cease financing loss making printing plants. Many newspapers will face great difficulties. It has been recommended to soviets of various levels that they decide which publications they need most and finance them from their own budget.

The minister also said that with the increase in the shortage of paper, it will primarily be supplied to the soviets' newspapers.

According to V.B. Bulgak's calculations, despite the increase in the price of periodicals the level of subscription should reach 50-60 percent of last year's.

RSFSR Renames Town, City, Oblast

LD2310194390 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 23 Oct 90

[Text] The Presidium of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet has adopted two decrees. The first ratifies the decision of the North Ossetia Supreme Soviet on changing the name of the town of Ordzhonikidze to Vladikavkaz. It has been acknowledged that the traditional Ossetian language Zauzhikau has been also restored.

The second decree resolves to rename the city of Gorkiy to Nizhniy Novgorod and Gorkiy Oblast to the Nizhniy Novgorod Oblast.

Nakhodka Free Enterprise Zone To Be Established

LD2410122390 Moscow TASS in English 1121 GMT 24 Oct 90

[Report by TASS parliamentary correspondent Lev Aksenov]

[Text] Moscow October 24 TASS—A free economic zone will be set up around the town of Nakhodka in the Soviet Far East. This was decided today by the Russian parliament which ruled to endorse the Nakhodka free economic zone statute within two weeks from now.

The Russian parliament had previously decided to set up such zones in Leningrad and Vyborg (Leningrad region),

in Primorsk territory and Kaliningrad, Chita and Sakhalin regions of the republic.

The Russian parliament's decision gives the sea port of Nakhodka and Partizanskiy district of Primorsk territory the status of a free economic zone [words indistinct] easy taxation and customs regime and simplified export-import procedures. The parliament declared that foreign investments in these zones would be legally protected by the Russian Federation. Their treatment cannot be less favorable than that of the property and property rights of juridic persons and citizens of Russia.

Economic zones are regarded here as part and parcel of the plan to switch Russia's economy over to market conditions.

Sverdlovsk Wins Foreign Trading Entitlement

PM2410135590 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 24 Oct 90 First Edition p 2

[Report by TASS correspondent N. Potapova: "Toward a Free City"]

[Text] Sverdlovsk—The Sverdlovsk Oblispolkom [Oblast Soviet Executive Committee] has won the right to carry out foreign economic deals independently. Businessmen will not need to be told the value of this—they know how much time and energy is spent on obtaining permission from the USSR Ministry of Foreign Economic Relations to set up barter deals or to buy or sell any item abroad.

Sverdlovsk has persistently fought for this right over a long period, just as it fought for Union government permission to independently sell abroad 5 percent of the output produced in the oblast. Five percent of Sverdlovsk output represents more than 1 billion rubles. These funds, for instance, could supply the oblast's residents with industrial goods and foodstuffs or renew plant technology.

"The oblispolkom itself can now decide which enterprise and which goods will be sold abroad as part of the 5 percent," S. Vozdvizhenskiy, first deputy chairman of the oblispolkom, said. "This independence is the first step toward big business. There has already been an agreement between USSR President M.S. Gorbachev and B.N. Yeltsin, chairman of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet, to open up Sverdlovsk—a city which was inaccessible to foreigners for many years—in the very near future."

Incidentally the Urals have a history of mutually advantageous cooperation between Russian and foreign capital. For instance, from 1813 onward metal from the Urals was used in setting up major American industries. A century later transatlantic capital was invested in the modernization of enterprises in the Urals.

The situation could now be repeated. The well-known phrase "horses for courses" is highly apposite in this context. After all, the Central Urals have abundant stocks of raw materials, and Sverdlovsk Oblast is one of the top oblasts in the country in terms of the volume of industrial output it produces. Its academic institutes, scientific research institutes, and design bureaus carry out research in many sectors of the national economy. The workers' level of professional training is quite high too. So the oblast can participate on an equal footing in the international division of labor, provided of course it acquires the necessary experience and creates favorable conditions for business development.

Preparations for the infrastructure needed to this end have already begun. A plot of land has been set aside in central Sverdlovsk to build a business center; offices for foreign firms; hotels; and concert, sports, and exhibition halls. According to preliminary calculations, this development will cost at least $100 million. But the city is deliberately undertaking this expenditure, all the more so since a free enterprise zone may emerge alongside it in the not-so-distant future. Well, free cities have minds of their own!

Volgograd Radio Sees Opportunity in Jamming End

PM2310140690 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Oct 90 First Edition p 3

[Article by Larisa Ulyanenko, State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting correspondent for Volgograd and Astrakhan Oblasts, under the "Top Secret" rubric: "Jamming, Advertising, and Commerce"]

[Text] "And now," the Mayak program commentator reported, "a piece of news which is plain sensational for recent times! A VOA-Volgograd radio linkup. Environmental scientists in the studios of two cities will discuss the problems of the pollution of rivers in the Volga basin and various watercourses in the United States."

For a long time we jammed this hostile radio station for any reason. Now this year alone doctors, judo fans, and finally ecologists have met up via a VOA radio linkup. This movement is increasing all the time. Electronic countermeasures, as communications operators call this expensive struggle for the purity of the airwaves, have been relegated to the cold war archives.

Sociologists claim that today, when our own mass media cover every event within and outside the country more quickly and objectively, when people have the opportunity to compare the reports of different agencies, and when the local press is as hard-hitting as the central press, interest in the forbidden fruit of foreign broadcasts has waned.

Then how is the aforementioned expensive equipment now being used?

...We are in an instrument room: Its equipment now serves one end—broadcasting information. Ada Krylova has worked here for many years.

"Even two years ago we received an order regarding a certain frequency, we adjusted our transmitter and clogged the airwaves with noise, jamming the foreign radio stations.

"Many people think that the mysterious jammer was the first to pick up news from 'over there.'

"But we did not get it either. We barred the doors on it, did not let it even cross our threshold."

Boris Kiselev, chief engineer of the Volgograd Radiocommunications Center, clarifies the situation:

"Today the station's work is being redesignated. Our technical facilities are being used for all-Union broadcasting. The main Moscow-Kuybyshev-Rostov radio link is transmitted on shortwave."

Unfortunately the former jamming station's powerful equipment is at present only being used at half capacity. The economic advisability of using such radio stations in the national economy was not originally envisaged. We now have the opportunity to recover the vast resources spent on 'protecting the ideological purity of the airwaves.' For example, all four Union channels could be relayed in the shortwave band. None of the oblasts surrounding Volgograd has such facilities. By pooling efforts the people of Volgograd could provide the four programs to those regions. Communications channels could be leased to the river fleet, aviation, the railroad, the meteorological service....

"At present, however, each department has its own, albeit low-power radio station," B. Kiselev said. "Although we do guarantee prompt and reliable communications."

"Could the communications operators transmit commercial, advertising, and private programs?"

"No problem. We have enough capacity—air time would be packed, varied, and useful. For example, the Kazakh Republic Television and Radio Broadcasting Committee has asked us to organize broadcasts in Kazakh and I know that Deutsche Welle provides original broadcasts in German. True, there have not to date been any enquiries on this score from the Volgograd Television and Radio Committee."

Yes, there are a host of opportunities here. Opportunities which bold, enterprising people can open up and tap so that we have a richer array of information, which will be an example of that glasnost which is everywhere described as part of our normal life and work.

But at present by not making use of the opportunities available we are again applying electronic countermeasures. This time against ourselves.

New Mordovian Supreme Soviet Chairman Elected

LD2410024590 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0930 GMT 23 Oct 90

[Report by correspondent S. Desyayev from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] The election system has already been subjected to criticism more than once and now one cannot say that the electorate is satisfied with the work of those they have elected. There are many rasons for it—the inability to choose a worthy one, and not the one who speaks nicely, and the absence of the choice itself. That is how it happened in Mordovia. The autonomous republic's Supreme Soviet deputies, without even allowing alternative candidates to be nominated, elected Anatoliy Ivanovich Berezin, oblast committee first secretary, as their chairman.

[Desyayev] Only half a year has passed, and due to public pressure from the Saransk City Soviet the same people had to raise the question of the dismissal of their chairman. In order to get into the hall where the session was taking place the deputies had to pass through pickets. That was the way Saransk residents tried to influence their delegates. The session satisfied Berezin's application to relieve him of the post of the Supreme Soviet chairman.

[A.P. Makarkin, Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic people's deputy and 28th CPSU Congress delegate] After reading the references from the USSR Committee for Public Control and the CPSU Central Control Commission, it was clear that this leader and many from his circle admitted numerous abuses using their official positions.

[Desyayev] Today it is most important to form a center in the republic. There are the extreme left and the extreme right, but there is no center.

[Makarkin] I agree with you entirely as extreme positions as a rule lead off the course. Now we really need to form a sound center that will normalize the political situation in the republic and solve the economic and social issues of our republic's development in a more clear-cut and precise manner and taking account of modern tendencies.

[Announcer] As a result of elections on the basis of more than one candidate, (Nikolay Ivanovich Biryukov), who earlier worked as Mordovian Supreme Soviet deputy chairman, became Mordovian Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet chairman.

Chelyabinsk Watch Plant Diversifies Output

PM2410114190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 22 Oct 90

[Report by S. Sergeyev and G. Kononov from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpt] [Announcer] The transition to working in market conditions is presenting labor collectives with considerable problems. Those who are endeavoring to solve these problems and seek a way out of deadlock situations without giving in to fear and panic are doing the right thing. That is what the Chelyabinsk watch factory, which our correspondent visited, is doing.

[Correspondent] The output manufactured here—Molniya mechanical and electronic watches—are well-known both on the Soviet market and abroad in many countries of Europe, Asia, Africa, and South America. Chelyabinsk exports pocket watches in original cases made of "new silver." A group of plant workers recently visited New Orleans in the United States where the National Association of Clock and Watch Collectors was holding its convention. Chelyabinsk's Molniya was enormously successful there, particularly with these watches. However today the plant does not only produce watches, but also other totally uncharacteristic output—printers, for instance, printing equipment for personal computers. They have mastered this innovation in conjunction with a defense enterprise in the Urals. So this is the fruit of military conversion. Production of a device to eliminate blood clots in pulmonary arteries developed by Chelyabinsk engineers and medics was authorized after clinical tests. Hundreds of lives will be saved thanks to these wonderful filters. This is also output produced by the Chelyabinsk watchmakers. Miniature automobiles for children like these are manufactured using waste products from the main production. [passage omitted]

Khasbulatov Pays Visit to Hungary

WA2310175290

For Hungarian reportage on the visit by Ruslan Khasbulatov, first vice president of the Supreme Soviet of Russia to Hungary, including reports on his talks with Gyorgy Szabad, speaker of the Hungarian National Assembly, Imre Szokai, deputy state secretary of foreign affairs, and senior representatives of the Hungarian Ministry of International Economic Relations, please see the Hungary section of the 23 October East Europe DAILY REPORT and subsequent issues.

Western Republics

Ukrainian Prime Minister Tenders Resignation

Masol Resigns

LD2310170490 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1640 GMT 23 Oct 90

[Report by UKRINFORM-TASS correspondent Stanislav Volnyanskiy]

[Text] Kiev, 23 Oct (UKRINFORM-TASS)—Today Vitaliy Masol, chairman of Ukraine's Council of Ministers, tendered his resignation, which the deputies of the republican Supreme Soviet accepted with a majority of votes.

In a statement which Masol addressed to the Supreme Soviet, he rejected accusations on the part of a number of deputies that the govrnment which he headed was to blame for the troubles being experienced by the republic. The government program to stabilize the republic's economy and take it out of the crisis was subjected to sharp criticism at today's session.

Vitaliy Masol was confirmed as chairman of Ukraine's Council of Ministers on 28 June. At that time he only got three votes more than the minimum necessary to be confirmed in the post.

Interim Prime Minister Named

LD2310200190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1900 GMT 23 Oct 90

[Text] Today the resignation of Vitaliy Masol, chairman of the Ukraine Council of Ministers, was accepted at the session of the Ukranian Supreme Soviet. Until a new head of government is appointed, his duties are being entrusted to Vitold Pavlovich Fokin, chairman of the committee on the economy.

Ukraine KGB Investigated Chernobyl Effects

91UN0109A Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 42, Oct 90 p 4

[Article prepared by V. Romanenko: "Four Years of Lies?]

[Text] **More than four years have passed since the Chernobyl accident, which completely altered the destinies of hundreds of thousands of people. For more than four years the Ministry of Health has tried to convince the population that it did everything possible to ease the aftereffects of the catastrophe. Material submitted to the editorial office by E. Borovetskaya and N. Dyrov, official experts of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee on Ecology and the Rational Use of Natural Resources, attest to the fact that this is far from the case.**

The Ministry of Health and the KGB

Starting in May 1986, specialists of the Military Medical Service (VMS) of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] KGB carried out an original investigation, independent of the Ministry of Health, which was systematized on a monthly basis. Analyzing the results of this investigation, they came to the following conclusions.

First. The scale and nature of radiation contamination attests to the possibility of very serious aftereffects of the accident. Radioactive substances (RV) were scattered in all directions and over considerable distances. Radioisotopes of cerium, niobium, zirconium, tellurium, neodymium, neptunium, ruthenium, lanthanium, and cesium, and recently transuranium elements, had a substantial and at times even a decisive significance in terrain

contamination for a prolonged period. They continuously entered the human body through food, water, inhalation, and the skin.

Second. In contrast to the Ministry of Health's official version, the Military Medical Service specialists believe that it was not the iodine and cesium that constituted the basic dose-forming factors for the human being—other than the thyroid gland—but a whole complex of radionuclides. The Ministry of Health stated, and its views have not changed, that their deposit in the formation of radiation loading can be disregarded. According to data of the KGB Military Medical Service, this deposit constituted 80 percent of the radiation doses received by the population, and in recent years 50-70 percent. That is, the Ministry of Health was deliberately lowering the radiation dose. Therefore the doses established by the participants in the elimination of the aftereffects of the accident should be recalculated.

Third. The Ministry of Health stated: Inasmuch as the doses received by the population in the surrounding rayons were not great, it is not worth paying attention to them. But specialists of the KGB Military Medical Service came to the conclusion that small doses lead to various kinds of disturbances in the human organism.

Fourth. The Ministry of Health irresponsibly stated that the multiplier of the joint action of the ionized radiation and heavy metals is equal to 1.3. Military Medical Service specialists demonstrated that even the joint effect of only external and internal radiation gives a significantly higher multiplier.

Fifth. The Ministry of Health announced that short-lived isotopes are not dangerous and therefore there is no need to consider them. The Military Medical Service specialists think that their deposit in the formation of radiation loading absolutely must be taken into account, inasmuch as during decay they produce high-energy particles and create high doses of exposure.

Sixth. In the opinion of the scientists of the Ukrainian SSR KGB Military Medical Service, the "35-rem" concept officially put out by the Ministry of Health is not only scientifically indefensible and potentially dangerous but also misinforms the population, scientific circles, and the government.

Information

As a result of the Chernobyl catastrophe the territories of three Soviet republics were exposed to radioactive contamination: the Ukraine, Belorussia, and the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] where more than 5 million persons now live—1.8 millionin the Ukraine, 2.4 million in Belorussia, and about 1 million in the RSFSR.

In the RSFSR the following were exposed to contamination—Bryansk, Kaluga, Tula, and Orlov Oblasts, and on a smaller scale Kursk, Smolensk, Litsepsk, and Tambov Oblasts; in the Ukrainian SSR Zhitomir, Kiev, Rovno, Chernigov, Cherkassy, and Vinnitsa Oblasts; and in the Belorussian SSR Gomel, Mogilev, Brest, Minsk, and Grodno Oblasts. There are traces in Krasnodar Kray, in Sukhumi Rayon, and in the Baltics.

As recently as April 1990, the USSR Supreme Soviet announced that the situation that has developed is a result of an incorrect estimation of the scale of the accident, poor coordination of actions, and lack of information on radioactive contamination—especially in 1986.

"Prohibition" Method

Parallel with medical and biological investigations, scientists of the Ukrainian SSR KGB Military Medical Service conducted a search for effective methods and nontoxic means for treating victims. Such a method was found.

Back in 1979, at the Institute of Oncology of the Ukrainian SSR Academy of Sciences, a lot of experience was accumulated on the application of hemosorption during radiation affection. The authors of the procedures—L. Pinchuk, V. Nikolayev, and V. Strelko—were awarded the USSR State Prize.

Probably because of significance of this work, L. Ilin, then vice president of the USSR Academy of Medical Sciences, decided to "adorn" the title page with the names of about another 30 of his colleagues, and his own. After this scientific piracy, all further means for the implementation of the method in Kiev were blocked.

However the Ukrainian SSR KGB military medical hospital, which was not under the authority of the third administration of the Ministry of Health, continued to employ the "prohibited" method. When the first patients began to arrive at the KGB hospital in May 1986 (KGB employees also took part in the elimination of the aftereffects of the accident), hemosorption and enterosorption were employed to reduce the doses and the intoxication of the body with radiotoxins.

The USSR Ministry of Health, Ye. Chazov, L. Ilin, and the All-Union Scientific Center of Radiation Medicine ignored the positive results of the treatment. Moreover, in April 1986 M. Zakharash, chief of the Ukrainian SSR KGB Military Medical Service, was even compelled to appeal to the governmental commission to ensure that the Biophysics Institute of the USSR Ministry of Health did not prevent the specialists of the hospital from working.

After the intervention of Yu. Petrov, deputy chairman of the Ukrainian SSR KGB, the question was resolved, but from April to June 1986 only KGB workers were treated with sorbents. In July, seeing the results of the treatment, the USSR Ministry of Defense decided to link its own contingent to the procedure in question.

In 1989, on learning of the serious condition of the health of the nuclear power employees who selflessly

operated the Chernobyl station in 1986, and of the fact that of 300 specialists 70 already died, physicians of the KGB Military Medical Service offered to help them. About 200 persons went through the course of treatment.

We will cite only one excerpt from the letter of a person who had already lost all hope of getting any better: "...believing ourselves already sentenced to a slow death, we have revived. For a period of three years after the accident I suffered everything imaginable, but after going through two courses of enterosorption, even pollinosis—an allergy ailment that developed after the accident—did not trouble me too much."

The results obtained on all of the victims who went through the course of hemosorption and enterosorption treatment were sent to the USSR Ministry of Health every year. In response... there was silence. Why did a whole number of offices to which the Ukrainian SSR KGB appealed not react to the unique results of the work carried out by the Military Medical Service specialists? Why was an effective procedure which could save so many lives rejected by those who should have developed a program to save people? We hope that answers to these questions will soon be found.

But one answer is already known. The age-old monopoly and autocratic striving to control a secret truth played its malicious role here as well. Being at the apex of the social pyramid and having become accustomed to the fact that in our country it is not laws that govern but people, the leadership of the Ministry of Health in a euphoria of total impunity tried to ignore the laws of nature also this time by issuing directive instructions. Only nature will not accept administrative command methods of managing radioactive decay. There are laws that cannot be violated or avoided, and the sooner we understand this the less society will suffer.

Crisis Situation in Kiev Soviet Reported

91UN0107C Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Oct 90 First Edition p 2

[Article by PRAVDA correspondent M. Odinets: "Petlyura Rejoices"]

[Text] Kiev, 13 October—**A year ago rallies were conducted once a month in Kiev and at the end of this summer—almost every week, and now they are going on almost every day. Today, like yesterday and the day before that, the movement of the streetcars was interrupted because of the rally in the center of Kiev next to the encampment of the students engaged in the hunger strike. Streams of people, abandoning their vehicles, again addressed indignant cries to the Kiev soviet which gave long-term permission for mass demonstrations in the very center of the city.**

Unfortunately, this is not the only decision of the Kiev Soviet Presidium that exceeded its authority and evoked many protests and complaints from Kievans. Perhaps this is why a crisis situation developed in the Kiev Soviet wherein its chairman, A. Nazarchuk, submitted a request for retirement.

At the same time the student hunger strike is continuing, causing a great deal of tension and alarm among the residents of Kiev. The rumors that have been spread without sufficient substantiation, to the effect that one of the students is already seriously ill and in the intensive care unit, have the purpose of deepening the alarm and intensifying the situation.

This is being discussed more and more in the city both by its residents and by the people's deputies. Yesterday evening on Ukrainian television one could hear the words of Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] People's Deputy A. Kotsyuba to the effect that there are forces who have put other people's children and not their own on the pavement in the square in order to disorganize the work of the legislature and government, and these children could become cripples. A. Kotsyuba stated that the student demands were the same as they were at the rally.

Today I wrote down a couple of them that rose above the placards next to the black and red Bandera banners. Here they are: "The CPSU is the most criminal organization!" "The criminal government—to an international court!" "Down with the yoke of the Union treaty!" "Kremlin, hands off the independent Ukraine!" And the slogan "Hammer and sickle—death and hunger!"

Today the republic newspapers published an open letter from 85 Ukrainian people's deputies to the students who declared the hunger strike. The ultimatum-like nature of the demands, it says in the letter, "is perceived as a monopolization of the right to truth, an organized attempt to place pressure on the deputies. Such an approach has nothing to do with the principle of political pluralism and will ultimately lead to destabilization of the political situation.

"...Concerned about your health and the peace of mind of your mothers and all those who are close to you and about the preservation of civic peace in the republic, we sincerely appeal to you—think again and again about the expediency of your actions and stop the hunger strike!"

Noon in Kiev. The good, wise advice of the senior comrades was not taken by the tent city. A rally is going on in Kreshchatik and around it. And the fact is that on Monday the session of the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet will continue its plenary meeting and the destructive forces are preparing for it....

Snegur Speech on Moldavian Sovereignty Published

91UN0079B Kishinev MOLDOVA SUVERANA in Russian No 6, 22 Sep 90 pp 1, 4

[Speech by Mircha I. Snegur, president of the Moldova SSR, at the Great National Assembly on 16 September

1990 in the village of Lunga, Dubesarskiy Rayon: "The Fate of the Republic Is in Our Hands!"]

[Text] Respected fellow citizens!

There is probably nowhere in world a state that has been more punished by fate, and that has endured more cruel blows from fate during all of its 1,000-year history, than ours. Our state came into existence and created its own musical instruments and language on both banks of the white-foamed Dnestr back in antiquity. And now today, at the end of this century, our dignity and our belief in good, humanity, and wisdom have again come to the fore.

Today, as the first steps are being made to build a sovereign Moldavian state, the Dnestr is again filled with the tears of the people. The grief of the ancient river is a mirror of our own grief caused by the intrigues of certain forces who are trying to dismember our land and who wish to see this land divided in order to try once more to dictate their will to us.

We should not forget that our little Moldova [Moldavia] has already been forcibly dismembered by those who have now ended up on the scrap heap of history. Those scholars who, motivated by certain interests, are presently trying to redraw the map of Moldova will end up there too.

We all know what the real situation is at the present moment in the rayons and population centers of the left bank area of the Dnestr. We also know those who wish to steal our land, to put us on our knees, and to destroy us. And we know that this situation did not arise yesterday or today. Its roots go much deeper. The population of the Dnestr region, a portion of our people, was the first to be put through the Stalinist meat grinder of forced collectivization, repression, and deportation. And later, after 1940, this machine also began to function on the right bank of the Dnestr.

The administrative command system carried out its anti-Moldavia policy for many decades, doing everything possible to wipe from the memory of the people their history, to disparage their culture, and to eliminate and supplant the language of the indigenous people. I am also referring of course to the disappearance of the schools of Ukrainians and of representatives of other peoples living together with us.

For years all types of leaders who flooded this land and secured soft posts for themselves have satisfied personal and political whims, profiting by slogans about the brotherhood of the peoples, friendship, and internationalism. When our people began to achieve their historical rights to a language, a literature, customs, and a culture, these same pseudointernationalists and pseudopatriots, sensing that they were losing trust and their soft posts, resorted to a well-known tactic of "divide and conquer!" attempting to push us down the road of civil war.

Our people are always prepared to rebuff these shameful actions decisively. The truth is that Moldavians, Gagauz, Ukrainians, Russians, Jews, and Bulgarians have, of course, their own ethnic interests. But it is also true that at the same time we all have a common higher interest—preservation of the territorial integrity of the land we inherited from our ancestors and preservation of social peace and mutual understanding. The history of our region does not include any interethnic clashes inasmuch as we, the indigenous population, have lived, and I believe will continue to live as brothers with those who have understood us and who have supported our holy aspirations and with those who wish to contribute to the prosperity of the sovereign State of Moldova.

The injustice and lawlessness will be halted. The current leadership of the republic has received a vote of confidence at the hands of the people in new democratic conditions. It was and always will be for the people, doing everything for its genuine prosperity.

The Declaration on the Sovereignty of the Moldova Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR], adopted by the Supreme Soviet on 23 June 1990, was a genuinely historic landmark for the fate of the people.

Moldavian sovereignty is reflected in two main aspects: Domestic and foreign. The domestic aspect of sovereignty for the State of Moldova signifies the independence of Parliament as the highest state organ. It is empowered with establishing unified legal norms in society, defining the legal competence of state and administrative organs and public organizations, endowing officials with rights and obligations, etc.

The foreign aspect of the sovereignty of our state is reflected in the independence of state authority and of legislative acts with regard to any other state, as well as with regard to standard international treaties and agreements. That is to say that the laws of another state or international standard acts are not valid on the territory of the Moldova SSR without the agreement of the Moldova SSR Supreme Soviet.

The republic, by way of the Declaration on Sovereignty, declares its right to belong to unions of states that may be delegated some powers, as well its right to review those powers or to withdraw from those unions in accordance with the procedure established by the respective treaty. At this moment we are taking part in the operations of commissions that are working out a plan for an economic community of Soviet sovereign states.

The ideologists of separatism are trying to represent these articles of our declaration as our wish to unite with Romania, although it has already been repeatedly declared that no one has any such intentions. These types of assertions all have the same goal: The goal of sowing instability and distrust between the indigenous population and the representatives of other peoples living alongside it in order to preserve under these conditions even just a few of the old structures and the system of

squeezing out our riches for the benefit of others, perhaps even for the benefit of organized crime.

As I have already stated, the truth is otherwise: Our republic is taking a most active and constructive part in the preparation of plans for a new Union. I would even say that our aspirations correspond entirely with the hopes of the absolute majority of sovereign republics. According to our plan, Moldova should enjoy full and real political and economic sovereignty, or in other words, we should be genuine masters on the land of our ancestors. The republic should have its own Constitution, its own citizenship, full ownership of its own territory, its own credit and financial system, its own organs for maintaining public order, and the opportunity to be involved in foreign economic activity.

We see the future of our republic in membership in an economic community in which political, economic, scientific, cultural, and other relations will be sanctified by means of treaties concluded with those sovereign states who wish to cooperate with us.

Incidentally, I wish to note that at the present time we are making a great effort to conclude bilateral agreements with Union republics. We are nearing the end of work over agreements with Lithuania, Russia, Latvia, Estonia, and Belorussia. Work is also underway on other documents on cooperation with the rest of the republics.

Such is the objective reality. As you see, it is completely different from what the separatists are trying to suggest, leading people into error.

The main task that the Parliament and Government of Moldova and the Presidential Council are presently working to resolve is the economic development of the republic and the search for a way out of the crisis we find ourselves in. The situation in industry, on construction sites, and in the provision of necessary goods to the population—including food goods—is very complex, and the preconditions exist for further deterioration.

Autumn frosts and the summer drought and hail inflicted significant losses on the republic's agriculture. Because of a great shortfall of grain and fodders, especially in the southern zone of Moldova, livestock farming is in an extremely difficult situation.

In the existing critical situation the leadership of the republic is taking specific measures to guarantee the normal functioning of the main sector of the national economy—the agricultural sector. As a result, all the farms that suffered losses as a result of the drought were fully supplied with seeds for grain crops for the autumn sowing. We reached agreement with the Republic of Kazakhstan to deliver to Moldova 500,000 tons of grain, and in Volgograd Oblast we are purchasing another 50,000-100,000 tons of grain. Other measures are also being taken to help the agricultural sector out of its current troubles.

But, occupied with current problems, we still have not lost sight of the future. In this context, attention is first devoted to the republic government's plan concerning the transition to a market economy; the plan already encompasses all the sectors of the national economy.

According to this plan, the republic's market should be unified and whole—it should not be divided into city and rayon autonomous sectors—and at the same time it should be able to be integrated with Union, European, and world markets.

The plan stipulates creating favorable conditions for the activities of entrepreneurs, overcoming the population's estrangement from production and the dissemination of material goods, and creating legal and political guarantees for realizing the economic interests of each citizen of the republic through the existence of rights to property and to initiative.

For the accomplishment of this genuine revolution in the economic life of the republic we need, of course, a certain transition period that could in our circumstances last two or three years. It is during this period that we must create the mechanisms and conditions necessary for the operation of the market; that is to say we must devise and adopt a system of laws that will form its legal basis. Work in this direction is going at full speed. The republic press has already published drafts of our laws on the economic independence of the Moldova SSR, leasing, property ownership, banks and the banking system, the state budget, land, and agricultural reform. Drafts of other laws are at the stage of being worked out. More than 20 laws are expected to be adopted at the autumn session of the republic's Parliament alone, and about 120 laws and decrees will be adopted in general over the course of these two to three years.

During this period significant changes will take place in our economic life. I will not mention all of them because I do not wish to take up too much of your time. I only wish to emphasize that relations between the republic budget and the Union budget will be restructured; various forms of state, collective, private, and other forms of property will receive great development; and there is an intention to create a National Bank, put emphasis on economic relations with foreign states, and train the necessary personnel for all sectors of the national economy.

The program for the transition to market relations stipulates the creation of an efficient system of social protections for the population. This system will be affirmed by a special law that is being worked on at this time.

I wish to emphasize that any measures for the transition to a market economy will only be adopted after there has been a nation-wide discussion.

As you see, we have many serious problems that must be resolved as soon and as well as possible. Each resident of the republic must work steadfastly toward that. We have

proclaimed our sovereignty, and consequently we and only we should solve our problems. And not through strikes, referendums, and illegal congresses; not through the creation of so-called republics; but humanely with mutual understanding, friendship, and a sincere civic desire to build a genuine sovereign republic in which people of any nationality would be proud to belong to its citizenry.

Dear compatriots! Do not allow yourselves to be caught in the net cleverly spread by provocateurs, intriguers, and plotters. They are weaving anticonstitutional plans based on lies, delusions, and fabricated separatist ideas. Be assured that in this case they will receive their just desserts.

The fate of the republic is in our hands. We will apply all our efforts to ensure that its healthy forces are united, and we will work in the most decisive and consistent fashion for the sake of the prosperity of our Moldova and its hard-working, honest, proud, and triumphant people.

Long live a sovereign Moldova!

[Signed and dated] MS, 18 September 1990.

Gagauz Republic Nationalist Sentiments Viewed

91UN0087A Kishinev SOVETSKAYA MOLDOVA in Russian 23 Sep 90 pp 2-3

[Article by V. Zelenchuk, corresponding member of the Moldavian SSR Academy of Sciences: "The National Development of the Gagauz"]

[Text] **National tension has been intensifying recently in the republic. One of the factors promoting this has been the event associated with national self-determination for the Gagauz—the 19 August Komrat proclamation of a Gagauz Republic. A declaration entitled "On the Freedom and Independence of the Gagauz People From the Moldovan [Moldavian] Republic," which emphasizes that citizens of Gagauz nationality retain their USSR citizenship and are not citizens of the Moldovan Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR]. In their published appeals, activists in the Gagauz movement describe this step as accomplishment of the very long-standing aspirations of the Gagauz people.**

Representatives of the Gagauz national movement have set forth their concept, whose basic proposals are that southern Moldova is the historical homeland of the Gagauz. In the resolution passed in Komrat, it notes that "giving due consideration to the fact that the territory of the western Prichernomorye (modern-day Budzhak) was historically the territory of the Turko-Polovetsian principality and was later unlawfully annexed by the principality of Moldavia, then the people living on the territory of the Gagauz Republic are the indigenous inhabitants of that region." Here, every line is a violation of the historical truth.

Bessarabia was never the historical territory of the Polovetsians who appeared on the lands of the lower Danube during the latter half of the 12th century and remained there until the middle of the 13th century. They were not a settled people but nomadic, and they did not use permanent dwelling places but rather temporary stopping places. There never was any such thing as a Polovetsian principality, but there was an alliance of Pechenezhko-Polovetsian tribes which were under the dominion of the neighboring states of Byzantium and Hungary. During the 1340's the Polovetsians were driven out of Pruto, the interfluve of the Dnester, by the Tatar Mongols and moved away to Bulgaria and Hungary. This is the question that arises: How could the principality of Moldavia be driven out of the Polovetsian if it came into being only during the 14th century, that is 100 years later than the departure of the Polovetsians from the lands that would become the future Moldavian state? It is historically wrong to identify the Polovetsians with the Gagauz. The Polovetsians were a people who disappeared after the 13th century, while the formation of the Gagauz started only in the 14th century.

Budzhak was never the place where the Gagauz were formed as an ethnic entity. This is common knowledge and Gagauz ethnographers have written about it many times. For example, in an article entitled "The Gagauz," published in 1988 in the reference book "Peoples of the World," S.S. Kuroglo wrote this: "The Gagauz living in the USSR are the descendants of settlers from Bulgaria who fled to Russia during the Russo-Turkish wars in the late 18th and early 19th centuries."

Research by the Bulgarian scholars V. Marinov, E. Boeva, and E. Sachev has shown that the Gagauz were formed across an extensive area of the Balkan Peninsula on the lands of Greece, Turkey, and Bulgaria. During the 16th and 17th centuries, in order to escape forcible Islamization, groups of the so-called Hasyl Gagauz from Greece and Turkey resettled in Bulgaria where they intermixed with the group of Bulgarian Gagauz that had arrived there earlier. Soviet scholar S.I. Bruk considers the Gagauz to be part of the Bulgarian ethnic group. There are now more Gagauz in Bulgaria than in the USSR.

The claim that the Gagauz are a socialist nation is equally doubtful. "At the present time the Gagauz ethnic entity has been formed as a socialist nation." This is what we read in a brochure entitled "On the Creation of the Gagauz Autonomous Socialist Republic as Part of the Moldavian SSR" (Komrat 1989, authors S.S. Kuroglo, K.P. Tavshamzhi, G.A. Gaydarzhi, M.V. Marunevich, A.S. Dimoglo, V.N. Yakovlev). When and where was the Gagauz nation formed? Until 1989 Gagauz scholars themselves considered the Gagauz in the USSR to be a nationality, while other scholars, for example, I.I. Dundarov of Bulgaria and D.K. Grama of the Moldovan SSR considered them an ethnic group.

Let us remember that a nation is characterized by a sufficiently large population, long-time residence on its own ethnic territory where it was formed, and finally prolonged development of its own form of writing,

literature, and other kinds of culture over many centuries. What we are dealing with here is the ignorance of the authors of the new "theories" on the laws of social development.

This question may perhaps arise: Is it really all that important what the Gagauz are—a nationality or an ethnic group? It is, taking into account that both international and Soviet law define the status of national sovereignty as a function of the level of social-ethnic development of a people. Remember that a nationality is a social-historical community of people having their own ethnic territory where they live in a compact way, with an established ethnic self-awareness and a formed language. With regard to ethnic groups (national groups), as F. Engels noted, they are fragments, parts of foreign nationalities or nations.

According to the internationally accepted standards, it is only nations and nationalities that have the right of national self-determination and the creation of a sovereign republic. Ethnic or national groups (national minorities) have the right to national-cultural autonomy. This delineation of rights, worked out and embodied in international law, is accepted in the USSR. One of the first acts of the Soviet state was the adoption in 1917 of the Declaration on the Rights of the Peoples of the USSR. This fundamental document defines precisely that the right to the creation of statehood is enjoyed by the peoples of Russia—that is nations and nationalities—while for national minorities and ethnic groups provision is made for the right of free development—that is to national-cultural autonomy.

The desire of legislators to limit the number of possible claimants to the formation of statehood is the expression of a rational system: Numerically small ethnic groups cannot guarantee the function of state institutions; thus the need to preserve the integrity of the state.

It is common knowledge that there are 101 ethnic groups in the USSR. If we propose that they should all be granted the right of sovereign states, then this would lead to chaos in ruling the country as a whole. For example, 40 ethnic entities live in France but the country is divided into 96 departments regardless of the nationality of the inhabitants. In addition to the French nation there are major ethnic groups such as the Bretons, (numbering 1 million people), the Alsatians (1.4 million), Corsicans (280,000), Walloons (60,000), Flemings (250,000), and Catalonians (250,000) who all have their own distinctive cultures and some even their own language. They all enjoy the rights of national-cultural autonomy.

The existence of definite standards for republic and Union legislation requires that we take them into account. Disregarding the accepted standards would signify an oversimplified approach to the resolution of a complex issue. And there is yet another that has been repeated many times by the activists in the Gagauz movement that disorients the masses of the Gagauz people. This is the claim that if a Gagauz republic is not created, then the Gagauz people will inescapably die off.

In that same brochure (on page 50) we read this: "The dual-language pincer movement—Russian universally and the Moldavian language as an obligatory subject while absolutely ignoring the social functions of language—combined with the disinterest in and disregard by the republic's earlier leadership of the specific needs in the development of the Gagauz people have resulted in assimilation processes that have now become far-reaching and led to a situation in which the native language and culture of the Gagauz has been reduced to a truly deplorable state, while the ethnic entity itself is on the verge of extinction."

Here the authors of the statement pass over in silence the fact that the law "On the Function of Languages on the Territory of the Moldavian SSR" passed on 31 August 1989 states the following in Section 1, Article 2: "In localities where a majority of the inhabitants of Gagauz nationality live, the language for official spheres of life is Gagauz or Russian." How can we talk about assimilation if the law has in this case put Gagauz and Russian on an equal footing with Moldavian in the official sphere? Let us consider how the thesis on the inescapable demise of Gagauz culture at this time, and even the total disappearance of the Gagauz people, jibes with the contemporary ethnocultural development of the Gagauz. Let us turn to the article by D.N. Tanasoglu and M.V. Marunevich "The Gagauz" (in the encyclopedia entitled "Literatura shi arta Moldovey" published in Kishinev 1985, Volume 1, page 169): "For it has only been in the years of Soviet power that favorable conditions have been created for a real burgeoning of the culture of the Gagauz. Following the consolidation of the written form of Gagauz (1957), school textbooks and books have been printed, pages of newspapers have been printed in the native language, personnel have been trained in various spheres of activity, illiteracy has been rapidly wiped out, and culture has been developed in the masses on an extensive scale."

In an article entitled "The Gagauz" (SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA 2 October 1988), D. Tanasoglu wrote this: "... along their historical path the Gagauz people have been subjected to various influences through peoples with whom they have had contacts, and this has enriched their own ethnic identity and their material and spiritual culture." We see that specialists in the field of Gagauz culture are writing not about its decline, but on the contrary about its enrichment and burgeoning. And the question arises: Why must the "Gagauz Khalky" activists so distort the history and culture of the Gagauz? It is not difficult to realize that this is a tactical move to show by any means possible the need to create a republic.

Of course Gagauz culture does need support for its further development. The public movement for the rebirth of Moldavian culture has also provided impetus for the rebirth of Gagauz culture. On 31 August 1989,

the 13th Session of the Moldavian SSR Supreme Soviet passed a law on the official language.

Simultaneously, a comprehensive program was adopted in 1989, a major portion of which dealt with the function of the Gagauz language and also questions pertaining to public education; the development of culture; the role of television, radio, and the press in this; and training for national personnel.

For the first time in the existence of the Gagauz ethnic entity, a broad program has been adopted at state level to develop Gagauz language and culture in general. Implementation of this program is essential development of the cultural autonomy of the Gagauz and it will provide an opportunity to preserve and further successfully develop the Gagauz ethnic entity, with the culture typical of it. Suffice it to recall that this program makes provision for the opening of a theater of music and drama in Komrat; the creation of an inter-VUZ [higher educational institution] department of Gagauz language; the publication of newspapers, a literary year book, a magazine for children; and so forth.

Neither in the Ukraine nor Kazakhstan nor Uzbekistan, where there are a number of Gagauz settlements and about 50,000 Gagauz live, are there any republic laws aimed at preserving and developing their culture.

Thus it is only in our republic that guarantees have been put in place for the preservation and further development of the Gagauz ethnic entity. It would seem that this should be accepted with satisfaction by the Gagauz ethnic entity. But right before our very eyes a different situation can be seen. Taking advantage of objective phenomenon of the upsurge in national self-awareness among the masses of the Gagauz people, the Gagauz national movement has started to make new demands all the time. In this way tension has been introduced into the national relations in the republic's population.

Instead of rallying the Gagauz people and directing their efforts to fulfillment of the program adopted to develop Gagauz culture, the unjustified demand has been made that Gagauz statehood be created—which would essentially mean the isolation of the Gagauz from the Moldavians, Bulgars, and Ukrainians with whom they live in close propinquity.

To justify their demands, the activists from the "Gagauz Khalky" movement have resorted to historical, ethnic, and legal arguments in which a number of distortions of history and the ethnic development of the population of Moldova have been allowed. For the last two years the idea has been instilled in the Gagauz people that they have some kind of ethnic exclusivity and "ancient rights" to the land of Budzhak. A complicated situation has now been created. The congress in Komrat that proclaimed the republic thus violated the constitutions of Moldova SSR and the USSR, which point out that Moldova SSR cannot be changed without the agreement of the Moldavian people. And so the deliberate proclamation of a Gagauz republic and its secession from the Moldova SSR is an unlawful act.

The Gagauz deputies must find another way to resolve their issues. This is the way of respect for the laws of Moldova SSR and the need to resolve problems that arise through the republic's legislature. A first step to a solution to the impasse and the search for alternative solutions would be to abandon the anticonstitutional decisions that have been adopted. There are such precedents in the country: On 25 August 1990, in the Abkhaz Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic, a decision was adopted on the sovereignty and secession from Georgia. The Georgian Supreme Soviet deemed this decision unlawful. Abkhazia has now rescinded the decision and a committee of national conciliation has been set up to find an optimal solution.

I think that the path of negotiation and search for well-considered solutions based on respect for the Constitution of the republic and the decisions of the Moldova SSR Supreme Soviet is the most correct one to resolve questions pertaining to the national development of the Gagauz.

Belorussian Communist Party Draft Bylaws

91UN0056B Minsk SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA in Russian 22 Sep 90 p 1

["Draft of Bylaws of the Communist Party of Belorussia"]

[Text] The Communist Party of Belorussia is a sociopolitical organization of proponents of the socialist path for the republic.

The **goal of the party**is civil accord in society, the socialist outlook, and the communist idea. It cooperates with everyone who is in favor of humanism and democracy.

The party provides equal rights and discipline for all of its members regardless of their services and the positions they hold. Allowing its members the right to different convictions and religions which do not contradict general human values, it gets rid of people who compromise the party and violate the bylaws.

The Communist Party of Belorussia operates within the framework of the republic constitution without legally reinforced privileges over other parties and movements.

In order to coordinate its actions with parties of the federation that have the same ideological and organizational basis, the Communist Party of Belorussia is a part of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, guided by the bylaws, program, and decisions of the CPSU that do not contradict the laws of the republic.

The Communist Party of Belorussia has an emblem and badges for its members (honored members).

I. PRINCIPLES OF PARTY ACTIVITY

1. The Communist Party of Belorussia consists of local organizations which, in keeping with the administrative division of the republic, are included in territorial (rayon, interrayon, and city) organizations.

Members of the party and the organization may create horizontal structures, regardless of their territorial location.

A party organization is considered the highest ranking of its constituent organizations (structures).

2. Directive, executive, and control functions are demarcated in the Communist Party of Belorussia.

Organs of organization (party):

—the management organ—congress, conference, meeting;

—the executive organ—committee (central committee), bureau of the local organization;

—the control organ—control commission;

—the information organ—newspaper, weekly, magazine, television studio.

The quantitative and personnel composition of the members of the party organs (candidates) is established by the congress, conference, or meeting. Replacements are made by the organ itself from among the candidates.

Members of the party organs (candidates) remain on the rolls in their local organizations and may transfer to a different one only by a decision of the organs that elected them.

Note: Candidate members to the bureau are not elected.

3. Party organs form the work (technical) apparatus under them. **The purpose of the apparatus** is to be the analytical and consultative-information center of the organization, party, or organ.

The structure and staff of the apparatus are determined:

—of executive organs—by the central committee;

—of control organs—by the party congress.

Labor legislation applies to workers of the apparatus, and they may not join party organs.

4. Organizations and their organs are guided in their activity by the principle of democratic centralism, meaning:

—election of members of all party organs and their leaders on a competitive basis;

—reporting by organs to their own and the higher organization;

—the right to defend their opinion after the adoption of a decision with mandatory execution.

The main methods of the activity of the organizations: information and agitation; individual persuasion; polemics, disputes, and discussions; meetings, rallies, and pickets; and demonstrations, marches, and parades.

5. Party organizations (groups) are autonomous in resolving all issues under the condition that the decisions that are made do not contradict the bylaws, program, or decisions of the party (organization). Only the management organ of the higher organization (party) can override a decision of the organization (structure).

Decisions are made by open voting at conferences (congresses, meetings) which are conducted when necessary, but no less than two general party, four in the territorial, and six in the local organizations during the period between elections.

The congress, conference, or meeting is convened by the first secretary of the organization (party) or the secretary of the local party organization (group). The agenda is announced in the party press no later than three months before its beginning (in the local organization it is three days).

6. Delegates to the conferences (congresses) are elected according to the permanent party districts after determining the opinion of the local organizations (district) about the agenda and according to the candidacies nominated to the party organs. By a decision of the aktiv of the territorial organization, delegates to conferences (congresses) of the Communist Party of Belorussia and the CPSU may be elected at the organization conference.

Secretaries of organizations (party), chairmen, editors, their deputies, and members of the organs are elected by the congress (conference) to which they are answerable. Secretaries of territorial organizations may be elected in local organizations with the approval of the results of the voting at the conference.

Co-option to party organs is now allowed!

7. Meetings, conferences, congresses, discussions, elections, referendums, plenums, or meetings are authorized if more than four-fifths of the delegates of the conference or two-thirds of the members of the organization, party, organ, or electoral district attend (have participated in) them. Those temporarily removed from the books are not counted when determining the initial quorum at the meeting.

The meeting, session, or plenum is conducted by the secretary of the organization (party), the chairman of the organ or his deputy (cochairman). A coordination group (presidium) consisting of three to five people is elected for conducting the conference.

The conference (congress) may take a break for the delegates to consult with local organizations and be conducted in stages. The delegates retain their authority

until the next conference, being delegates to extra ones as well. Members of party organs and Communists and people's deputies from the organization (party) who are not elected as its delegates participate in the work of the conference (congress) with the right of an advisory vote.

8. A decision is considered adopted if more than half of the overall number of members of the organization, party, organ, or conference delegates have voted for it.

For the most important issues a decision is adopted with two-thirds of the votes when:

—accepting or transferring candidate party members;

—withdrawing, expelling, or suspending party membership;

—joining a horizontal structure and withdrawing from it;

—suspending the activity of an organization;

—transferring candidate members of a party organ to membership in it;

—approving (changing) the agenda and regulations;

—adopting documents regulating activity within the party;

—one-fifth of the members of the organization (organ) or delegates demand it;

—repeating voting on a decision that has been adopted.

At the demand of one-fourth of the members (delegates) a decision is made with the condition that there be a consensus or by a rollcall vote.

Members of the party (organ) have the right, without special authority and guided by the decision that is adopted, to speak on behalf of the organization (party, organ).

9. An extraordinary congress, conference, meeting, or plenum is convened on the initiative of the control commission, one-fourth of the organizations (structures), or one-fifth of the overall number of members of an organization or party (organ) or delegates to the preceding conference (congress) who do not agree with the policy conducted by the organ or its leader, and it is considered authorized if no less than two-thirds of the members of the organization, party, or organ attend it.

Members of the party and organization who demand to have an extraordinary conference (congress) convened have the right to form the organizing committee for conducting it.

10. Discussions and referendums concerning fundamental, disputed, or insufficiently clear issues (drafts), are conducted in the party (territorial organization) on the initiative of the congress or conference of committees (central committee), one-fourth of the organizations, or one-fifth of the overall number of members of the party.

Changing the name of the party, its program, or its bylaws, withdrawing from the CPSU, or disbanding the party are possible only by a partywide referendum after discussion on the condition that more than three-fourths of the overall number of party members have voted in favor of this.

11. Decisions that have been adopted are implemented by committees (bureaus of local organizations) or plenums (meetings) that meet as necessary, but no less frequently than:

—central committee—once every three months;

—territorial organization—once every two months;

—local organization—once a month.

Between the plenums, decisions are implemented by a bureau elected by the corresponding committee (central committee). At least one-fifth of the members of the bureau change each year. Secretaries of the organization (party) are members of the committee and bureau.

In local organizations with less than 100 members, instead of a bureau they may elect:

—a secretary;

—one or two deputy secretaries;

—a treasurer.

12. Secretaries, bureaus, and committees (central committees) are authorized to act only within the framework of the decisions adopted by the organization (party) and they are obligated to report to the local organizations at their request.

At the suggestion of one-fourth of the delegates to the conference or congress (members of the local organization), they consider the question of a vote of confidence in the secretaries of the organization (party), the chairmen (editors), deputies, or members of party organs.

The question of withdrawing them from the organ is decided after a report on their activity on the initiative of:

—the management organ—when there is a vote of no confidence;

—the local organization (electoral district) from which the given member of the organ was elected;

—the organ itself or its control commission;

—a member of the organ if the organ has retired.

13. In order to determine the opinion of the organization, party, or horizontal structures and to coordinate their activities concerning problems that arise in the life of the party and society, the committees (central committees) convene meetings of the aktiv. The aktiv includes secretaries of organizations (party), members of bureaus, and leaders (cochairmen) of horizontal structures.

The meeting of the aktiv:

—assesses the political situation and earmarks tactics of actions;

—approves the agenda and the date of the next conference (congress);

—forms (changes) party districts and election commissions;

—establishes the voting procedure.

The meeting of the aktiv is authorized if no less than four-fifths of the organizations and horizontal structures attend it.

A decision of the aktiv is adopted by two-thirds of the overall number of organizations.

14. Party members may not be on the executive, information, and control organs at the same time or on more than two of the vertical structures at the same time, including CPSU organs.

First secretaries and chairmen of organs are not elected more than twice to the same position. The age limit for these positions is 60 years.

Members of the bureau elected by the committee (central committee), secretaries of organizations (party), chairmen of control commissions, and members of their families may not be a part of the leadership or government (executive organs) of the republic or federation, soviets of people's deputies, arbitration board, court, procuracy, ministry of justice, armed forces, internal affairs ministry, or state security committee; or receive remuneration from state, cooperative, social, or other organizations for services rendered.

15. Applications, addresses, appeals, and protests from party members are considered in the party organs within a month. Applications for admission to the party, withdrawal, and suspension of membership are considered within two months.

Appeals (protests) of decisions of party organs and disagreements among organs are considered at the conference (congress) to which they are subordinate.

16. The Communist Party of Belorussia, its territorial organizations and their organs are corporate bodies and have their own stamp.

The local organizations and horizontal structures may be corporate bodies and have their own stamp.

II. PARTY MEMBERSHIP

a) Admission into the party

17. A citizen of the Soviet Union who has reached 18 years of age, who accepts the goal of the party and its program, who observes the requirements of the bylaws, who participates in the activity of one of the local organizations, who implements party decisions, and who renders financial support to it may be a member of the Communist Party of Belorussia.

18. A person entering the party submits to any local organization a personal application with written recommendations from two party members of the given local (territorial) organization who have more than five years in the party and have known the applicant through joint social, political, or other activity for no less than two years.

19. Members are accepted into the party at a meeting of the local organization where the recommending members and party group introduce the newcomer. Acceptance in absentia is not allowed. An individual may be accepted without recommendations only in exceptional cases. The members making the recommendations are responsible to the party for the objectivity of the description of the political, business, and moral quality of the person being recommended and their names are entered on the report. The decision of the party organization to accept a member is final.

20. If necessary, in order to study the candidate, on his own initiative or by a recommendation of the territorial control commission, the local organization establishes a probationary period of one year for the candidate.

The transfer of candidates from one local organization to another is not envisaged.

b) Rights and responsibilities of party members

21. A party member has the right:

—to select the local organization in whose activity he wishes to participate and transfer from one organization to another (with the agreement of the latter);

—to elect and be elected to party organs, to form a local organization, and to give recommendations to people entering the party;

—to discuss freely at meetings, conferences, congresses, plenums, sessions, and in the mass media the political and practical activity of the party, organization, or organ; to criticize any party member regardless of the position he holds;

—to make applications and requests to party organs; to submit suggestions, projects, and platforms; to give joint reports; and to organize groups (factions) of proponents;

—to have, express, and defend his opinion, including after a decision is adopted;

—to participate personally in sessions of organs, meetings, and conferences when his suggestions or activity and behavior are being discussed;

—to be under party protection in the event of an unsubstantiated accusation for sociopolitical activity;

—to obtain informational materials he needs in his local (territorial) organization, party, or their organs;

—to publish announcements, appeals, and proposals and to publish a press organ without disclosing the tactics (strategy) of preelection, parliamentary, or other activity that is defined in a decision as a party (commercial) secret;

—to attend sessions and meetings and participate in debates with the right of an advisory vote in those organizations and their organs where he is registered;

—to cooperate (be a member) in party clubs, interregional groups, social organizations, and movements whose principles and activity do not impede the implementation of Communist Party of Belorussia and CPSU programs;

—to use the property and services of the organization (party);

—to have rest and treatment in party health (treatment) institutions;

—to withdraw from the party or suspend membership during a period when he is unable to participate in the activity of the organization (party).

22. A party member must:

—participate in the activity of the organization in which he is registered, and in the event of prolonged (more than three months) absence, is temporarily registered in the party organization where he is located and informs his own organization of this;

—participate in the political life of the country (in state and social organizations), in rallies and meetings, and in the collective, and to individually explain party policy and its goals and decisions that are offered to society;

—act as the initiator of progress, to master the theory and practice of the development of society, to expand his political and cultural horizons, and to contribute to the self-government of the people;

—observe principles of behavior and morality, affirm social justice, be sensitive and attentive to people and fair and honest to the party and the people, and respect the opinions and rights of party comrades;

—contribute to mutual understanding and friendship among peoples of the USSR and throughout the world and wage a battle against manifestations of misanthropic ideologies;

—protect the party from invasion of its ranks by people who do not support the socialist path; protect party secrets;

—implement party decisions, pay membership fees each month, and be unswerving in all cases when party bylaws are being violated.

Note: If because of ethical, moral, or religious considerations a decision that has been adopted is unacceptable to a party member, by a decision of the executive organ of the organization that made the decision (party), he may be released from implementing it.

23. A member of the Communist Party of Belorussia is also a member of the CPSU.

Candidate members of the Communist Party of Belorussia participate in all the activity of the local organization, are included on the council of party veterans, and are respected members of the territorial organization.

c) Incentives and responsibility of party members

24. For the successful fulfillment of party instructions, party members (candidates) are encouraged by the local or territorial organization (party). The kinds of incentives are: gratitude; a certificate; monetary remuneration (gift); a free vacation to recreation and treatment facilities.

Organizations may provide additional incentives using their own money.

Note: The performance of duties in party organs is not considered to be fulfillment of party instructions.

25. Peer pressure is applied to members of the organization by party penalties: oral remarks and reprimands.

Penalties are imposed by the local organization. Its decision to hold someone accountable is final.

The question of the party responsibility of party members (candidates) who have been taken to court is considered after the sentence legally goes into effect and a party investigation has been conducted.

d) Suspension of party membership

26. Withdrawal from the party.

An application for withdrawal from the party or suspension of membership in it is considered by the local organization, whose decision is final.

27. Expulsion from the party.

This is carried out by the local organization for: failure to carry out party decisions; lack of objectivity in recommendations; persecution for criticism; commission of actions that compromise the party; divulging of party secrets; failure to pay dues for three months without a good reason; failure to participate in the activity of the organization; and other actions whose consequences, in

the opinion of the local organization, are not compatible with membership in the party.

Secretaries of the organization (party), leaders, members and candidates for its organs are expelled from the party after they have been removed from the organs.

A decision of the local organization to expel someone goes into effect after it is approved by the territorial control commission, to which all materials and the party card are sent.

Before the approval of a decision for expulsion a party member has the right to attend closed meetings and participate in the activity of the organization.

The names of those who have been expelled are published in the party press.

28. A person who has been expelled from the party has the right to submit an appeal to the Communist Party of Belorussia Control Commission within two months, and if it is rejected he may appeal to the CPSU Central Control Commission. Penalties and refusals to accept people into the party are not subject to appeal.

Individuals who have been expelled and left the party have the right to enter the party again no sooner than three years after their expulsion or withdrawal.

The return to the party is considered the same as entering for the first time.

When membership is temporarily suspended, the member retains his previous tenure.

III. PARTY STRUCTURE

a) Local organizations

29. Local organizations are created in the place of residence, work, service, or other activity at the suggestion of the territorial organization or on the initiative of 20 party members in keeping with the laws of the republic.

The local organization is the political center of the party and may have from 15 to 150 members or more if the organization itself so wishes.

All local organizations have equal rights. An organization whose membership has dropped below 15 loses its status as a local organization.

Local organizations of military units (institutions) of the Armed Forces, the Ministry of Internal Affairs, the KGB, and other associations under the jurisdiction of the government (president) of the USSR and guided by the CPSU bylaws (Communist Party of a subject of the federation) which are located in the republic are temporarily registered in the Communist Party of Belorussia.

30. The local organization:

—accepts new members, awards party cards, creates information organs and other necessary structures, and enters associations along the horizontal;

—nominates (discusses) candidacies of delegates to conferences (congresses) and of members and leaders of organs of territorial organizations, the party, the CPSU, and horizontal structures;

—considers questions that will be resolved in the territorial organization of the party or CPSU and sends delegates to conferences (congresses) to express the opinion (draft documents) of the local organization regarding the issues under discussion;

—participates in party discussions, elections, and referendums;

—carries out party decisions and monitors the implementation of decisions by the executive organ of the territorial organization (party);

—conducts political activity among the population and in the collective directed toward implementing the party line and propaganda of socialist ideas and communist ideals;

—organizes the nomination of candidate deputies to the soviets and to elective positions in the self-management organs, the collective, and state, cooperative, trade union, social, and other organizations; conducts the election campaign;

—hears reports from delegates to conferences and congresses about their own personal position when adopting decisions; from secretaries and bureau members about their activity; from members (candidates) of the territorial organization (party) who are registered about the work of the organ; from party members (candidates) about the fulfillment of party assignments; from party members about the recommendation by an organization that a candidate be denied admission;

—defends, renders assistance, provides incentives, holds liable, initiates petitions for recall from organs, and expels its own members (candidates) both on their own initiative and at the suggestion of the control commission; bears responsibility for its commitments;

—makes the decision to disband itself.

31. Within the local organization, in territorial, production, service, social, and other structures (subdivisions) with from three to 20 members (and, with their agreement, also more) permanent or temporary party groups are created.

Party groups (factions) consisting of party members are also formed at congresses, conferences, and meetings convened by state and other organizations and in the elective organs of these organizations.

The task of the party groups is to implement party policy and ideas in the corresponding nonparty organizations through the influence of party members on the decisions that are made and the development of democratic forms for the activity of these organizations.

b) Territorial organizations

32. The territorial organization unites the local ones on the territory of the city, rayon, several rayons, or party of one when there are 6,000-8,000 members and it is the basic structural unit of the party that carries out its policy.

All territorial organizations are equal.

33. The territorial organization:

—keeps track of party members, monitors admission, withdrawal, and suspension of party membership;

—registers local organizations, associations of them, party clubs, interterritorial groups, and other horizontal structures;

—forms party groups (coordinates their activity) in soviet, trade union, cooperative, social, and other nonparty elective organs;

—conducts meetings, conferences, aktiv sessions, and other measures for nominating and electing people in party electoral districts;

—discusses candidates nominated to party (CPSU) organs;

—conducts political activity in society, and coordinates the actions of the local organizations and their horizontal structures when conducting election campaigns;

—generalizes (analyzes) the course of social development and discussion in interterritorial party groups and earmarks ways and means of realizing the party program and ideas;

—renders party support and legal and financial aid to party members in their social (political) activity;

—provides expert evaluations of draft laws and normative acts being applied by state and social organizations, and brings up for consideration by organs of state power proposals for solving social, ecological, cultural, and other problems;

—organizes the preparation of propagandists and the training of the aktiv of the local party organizations in the practice of social and party activity; renders assistance to party members in studying the theory of the development of society;

—provides a link with the press, radio, television, and institutions of science, religion, and culture, engages in publishing, commercial, and economic activity, and takes responsibility for its own duties;

—cooperates with youth organizations, advocates their socialist and communist ideas, and prepares additional members from among those who share the party goals;

—arranges contacts with social organizations and movements; informs local organizations and horizontal structures about the political situation in the rayon, city, or okrug;

—contributes to mutual understanding among ethnic groups, segments of the population, armed forces, and the people;

—creates groups of party veterans and takes advantage of the experience and knowledge of veterans in practical activity; is concerned about their health and material and living conditions.

c) The horizontal structure of organizations

34. Horizontal structures are created by party members (no less than three) and organizations (collective members) for coordination of their activities concerning the tasks (interests) they are working on in the forms of:

—party clubs (circles);

—discussion centers;

—councils of secretaries of local party organizations;

—interterritorial (interregional) theoretical groups, and so forth.

When uniting, local organizations retain their status according to the nature of their activity in a production, scientific, military, social, or other structure.

35. Horizontal associations:

—independently determine their structure, membership cards, symbols, and the task they address; elect coordination, executive, and control organs; dispose of their own financial funds; and bear responsibility for their obligations;

—approve documents reflecting the association's position;

—conduct publishing and other information activity;

—nominate candidate delegates to conferences, congresses, and organs of territorial organizations (parties), and conduct election campaigning;

—develop alternative variants of party and state documents (laws, normative acts);

—make the decision to suspend their activity.

Note: A horizontal structure with more than 20 members has the right to nominate candidates.

36. City, rayon, and interrayon organizations for coordination of party measures and ties with state, social,

and other organizations create the oblast (city) council of secretaries, which includes all first secretaries of territorial organizations.

d) Organs of the organization (party)

37. The management organ:

—hears reports from its (lower) organs and their leaders and adopts decrees concerning them;

—creates and eliminates organizations, institutions, establishments, enterprises, newspapers, magazines, and television studios of the party; the general party organ approves the symbols and disbands local organizations (horizontal structures) whose activity contradicts the bylaws and program of the party;

—adopts documents regulating activity within the party;

—approves the party budget;

—sums up the results of discussion and determines the party (organization) line on questions of internal and external policy;

—earmarks the directions for cooperation with other parties, social organizations, and movements;

—elaborates (develops) socialist and communist ideas and determines the strategy and tactics for implementation of the party program;

—elects secretaries, organs, and their leaders (deputies) of the organization (party) and representatives of executive and control organs of the CPSU.

38. The executive organ:

—forms permanent or temporary commissions and elects secretaries of the committee (chairmen of commissions);

—carries out decisions of the organization (party) and verifies their execution;

—draws up the party budget and distributes the money in the budget that is established;

—establishes ties with parties, movements, and state, social, and other organizations in the federation and abroad;

—prepares party congresses, conferences, meetings, aktiv sessions, discussions, elections, and referendums; coordinates the actions of organizations when conducting election campaigns in a block with other parties and movements;

—submits draft laws and normative acts to legislative organs through people's deputies who are party members; coordinates the activity of party factions;

—selects personnel for party institutions, establishments, enterprises, and the committee of the apparatus, and organizes the preparation (training) of the aktiv.

The bureau—a permanent executive organ of the committee (Central Committee)—conducts the daily work of the committee between plenums.

39. Secretaries of the organization (party):

the first secretary heads the organization (party) or committee (Central Committee) and coordinates the activity of the commissions of the committee;

the local organization and its bureau are headed by the secretary of the local organization:

the party group is headed by the group secretary (chairman of the faction);

the second secretary is in charge of the bureau elected by the committee;

the third secretary is in charge of the work of the apparatus of the committee (Central Committee): organizational; program; legal; financial; interparty; interethnic; youth; and so forth.

Note: In organizations that elect only two secretaries, the work of the committee apparatus is led by the organization's second secretary.

40. The information organ:

—compares various views, platforms, critical remarks, and statements;

—clarifies the opinion of the party and society concerning party documents and leaders of the organization, party, and organs;

—publishes statements (proposals, appeals) of members of the party and organizations who demand that an extraordinary conference or congress be convened, or a discussion or referendum be held, or who do not agree with a decision that has been made.

Note: Representatives of party information organs have the right to attend the meetings of any organs and carry out their commitments; party organs have the right to be the first to disseminate their official documents.

41. The control organ:

—checks on the admission and objectivity of recommendations of people entering, being expelled, withdrawing, and suspending their membership, the course of elections to organizations (parties), and their financing;

—considers appeals (protests) of members of the party, organizations, and their organs;

—fills out party cards and keeps track of party members;

—verifies the implementation of bylaws and party decisions and registers organizations and interterritorial associations of organizations and party members. The Control Commission of the Communist Party of Belorussia has the right to interpret (clarify the provisions) of the bylaws;

—checks on the correctness of the execution of the party budget, the acceptance and accounting of membership fees, and financial and economic activity;

—monitors the distribution of passes to party sanatoriums, bases, and houses of recreation, the payment of monetary remunerations and bonuses from party funds, and the observance of the established procedure for conducting business;

—checks on the observance by party members (organs) of ethics and morality, making sure there are no benefits or privileges for the leadership or the party apparatus.

Note: The decrees of the Control Commission are mandatory for execution and protests against them are considered by the conference (congress).

IV. PARTY PROPERTY AND MONETARY FUNDS

42. The property of the party (organization) includes its buildings, structures, enterprises (shares, securities), equipment, technology, means of transportation, and the property necessary for their activity.

43. The monetary funds of the party (organization) are compiled from membership fees, income from publishing, commercial, business, and other activity permitted by the law, and voluntary contributions of party members, horizontal structures, citizens, collectives, and organizations.

The budget of the organization (party) is approved by its management organ.

44. The monthly dues for party members (candidates) are established in the following amounts:

with incomes up to 70 rubles [R]—10 kopeks; R71-100—20 kopeks; R101-150—30 kopeks; R151-250—one percent; more than R250—two percent.

Dues of pensioners are calculated separately from the pension and from wages. Dues of members of party clubs, interregional groups, and other horizontal structures are voluntary in excess of those required in the local organization.

The entry fee is R2.

45. The local organization keeps 50 percent of the sum of membership fees for its own needs and sends the rest: 30 percent to the territorial organization; 15 percent to the Communist Party of Belorussia Central Committee; five percent to the CPSU Central Committee.

Profits, donations, contributions from candidates, and special contributions are disposed of separately.

Local organizations included in the horizontal structures include additional (in excess of 50 percent) funds in their budgets in an amount established by the conference (meeting) of the association.

46. Positions of full-time secretaries, chairmen of organs, their deputies, and apparatus workers are established on the condition that they are financed at the expense of the given organization or financial structure. If they have their own funds, they are permitted to increase the number of positions and salaries for party staff (apparatus) workers and pay for the public activity of the aktiv (members of the organization).

Caucasus

Situation in Nagorno-Karabakh Reported Worsening

LD2310205290 Moscow TASS in English 2038 GMT 23 Oct 90

[By TASS correspondent Vadim Byrkin]

[Text] Stepanakert October 23 TASS—Although many firearms were seized in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Region over the past few days, local residents still hide a lot of them. Regrettably, both Armenians and Azerbaijanis use these weapons to attack each other.

They also often attack army patrols guarding law and order in the region. An Army patrol was fired on by three unidentified people near Mardakert on October 19.

Later in the day, when interior troops tried to prevent the stealing of cattle from the Armenian village of Norshen, they were attacked by the bandits.

Troops returned fire in both cases, and the attackers were forced to retreat. The troops suffered no casualties.

Bandits have stolen more than several dozen thousands of head of cattle in the region. Incidentally, cattle is often used to exchange for hostages.

Five passengers of a Lada car were abducted near the Azerbaijani village of Srkhavend on October 20. Three of them are students of the Stepanakert branch of the Kirovokan Teachers' Training Institute.

Abductors demanded the return of earlier stolen cattle in exchange for Armenian hostages. Students are demonstrating in Stepanakert for the second day, coming to the commandant's office and demanding the release of hostages as soon as possible.

Five Azerbaijanis were abducted in Mardakert District on October 22. TASS learnt at the commandant's office that talks are in progress to release them.

Hostages were also taken in the village of Leninavan, Mardakert District, where two Armenian shepherds were abducted together with 1,000 head of cattle, sheep and goats.

Their fate is unknown. An Azerbaijani motor convoy was showered with stones in the same village on October 22. Interior troops who escorted the convey opened fire, killing one villager and wounding several others.

All these cases are being investigated. Sober-minded Armenians and Azerbaijanis are raising their voice in protest against the escalation of violence and tension, since they understand that ethnic strife leads nowhere.

Two Armenian Legislators Released From Jail

LD2310174890 Moscow TASS in English 1704 GMT 23 Oct 90

[Text] Moscow October 23 TASS—Two Armenian parliamentary deputies arrested in the disputed enclave of Nagorno-Karabakh on October 10 have been set free following protests from the republican Supreme Soviet and president, IZVESTIYA reports today.

R. Agadzhanyan and G. Grigoryan were arrested in the Nagorno- Karabakh capital of Stepanakert without the knowledge of the local public prosecutor or the presentation of any charges.

The Armenian Supreme Soviet and President Levon Ter-Petrosyan strongly protested the illegal arrest.

Since the two deputies were moved to a prison in the city of Saratov in the Russian Republic, Russian President Boris Yeltsin was also sent a protest, IZVESTIYA said.

Agadzhanyan and Grigoryan were released and are attending a session of the Armenian Supreme Soviet, it added.

Armenian Supreme Soviet Informed

NC2310183890 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 0400 GMT 23 Oct 90

[Text] The Armenian Supreme Soviet met on 22 October and confirmed the agenda of the full-scale meetings for this week.

Arutyunyan [deputy chairman of the Supreme Soviet] presided over the meeting and noted that the central authorities, acceding to numerous protests [word indistinct], released Agadzhanyan and Grigoryan, the people's deputies of the Armenian Republic who were illegally detained in Stepanakert.

The USSR People's Deputy Balayan briefed the legislature about the general situation in Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomnous Oblast, and in particular about the transfer to Azerbaijan of a group of hostages taken from Mardakertskiy Rayon.

(?The session also discussed amendments to some items on the agenda.) It first took up the bill on the recall [from Moscow] of the Armenian Republic's people's deputies. Voskanyan, chairman of the Supreme Soviet's Credentials and Ethics Commission, delivered a report. The following people spoke and made proposals on this issue: Igityan, Bagdasaryan, Tadevosyan, [names indistinct], and others. Contradictory views were expressed on the bill, including the view that the very endorsement of such a decision would be inappropriate. The Supreme Soviet decided to return the bill to the Credentials and Ethics Commission for redrafting.

Levon Ter-Petrosyan, chairman of the Armenian Supreme Soviet, delivered a report on the republic's political situation and replied to deputies' questions.

The session was also addressed by Richard [last name indistinct], head of the delegation from Grenoble, deputy of the French Parliament, and general secretary of the Union party. He spoke about his delegation's contacts in Armenia, French public opinion of Armenia and the Armenian people, and the development of mutual cooperation.

In response to deputies' demands, the Supreme Soviet created new commissions responsible for the Republic's administrative divisions, for renaming places, and for the search for those lost without a trace in the earthquake zone.

At the evening session, the deputies raised other questions; in particular, they dwelled on the difficulties in the supply of foodstuffs and primary consumer goods, and on the disruption of [words indistinct] in the Republic.

Armenian Supreme Soviet Passes Decisions

On Detaining Deputies

NC2310153090 Yerevan ARMENPRES International Service in Armenian 1215 GMT 18 Oct 90

["Decision of the Armenian Republic's Supreme Soviet on the Illegal Detention of the People's Deputies of the Armenian Republic"—ARMENPRES headline]

[Text] Yerevan, 18 Oct (ARMENPRES)—Roles Gevorgovich Agadzhanyan and Hamlet Vagarshakovich Grigoryan, people's deputies of the Armenian Republic's Supreme Soviet, were detained on 9 and 10 October in Stepanakert in Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast without the Armenian Supreme Soviet's consent. Such a bizzare incident conflicts with the Soviet and Armenian Constitutions and with the laws "on the status of the people's deputies of the USSR" and "on the status of the people's deputies of the Armenian Republic," according to which the Republic's people's deputies enjoy immunity throughout the USSR.

The Armenian Republic's Supreme Soviet regards this illegal act as a crude violation of the sovereignty of the Armenian Republic and of human rights, through which

the central autorities seek to further exacerbate the region's explosive political situation, obstruct the course of the democratic reforms, and restore administrative command methods.

Such acts confirm that the central authorities are making yet another attempt to disregard the union republics and experiment with totalitarian methods in the region as they did during the instigation of interethnic massacres and clashes.

The Armenian Republic's Supreme Soviet decides:

1) To demand that Soviet President M.S. Gorbachev take measures for the immediate release of the illegally detained Armenian People's Deputies Roles Gevorgovich Agadzhanyan and Hamlet Vagarshakovich Grigoryan and call to account those guilty of the illegal detention.

2) To instruct the Legal Affairs Commission of the Armenian Republic's Supreme Soviet to study the facts related to the illegal detention of the Armenian people's deputies R. Agadzhanyan and H. Grigoryan and to submit its findings to the session.

3) To hold the USSR's president fully responsible, as required by the presidential oath, for the consequences of failing to prevent the illegal act committed against the Armenian Republic's People's Deputies R. Agadzhanyan and H. Grigoryan.

4) To draw the attention of the Supreme Soviet of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic] to this issue and request its opinion on the illegal detentions in view of the fact that the detained deputies have been transferred to the Russian Federation.

[Signed] L. Ter-Petrosyan, chairman of the Armenian Republic's Supreme Soviet.
A. Saakyan, secretary of the Armenian Republic's Supreme Soviet.

On Service for Draft Dodgers

NC2310155190 Yerevan ARMENPRES International Service in Armenian 1215 GMT 22 Oct 90

[Text] Noting that the 3 May 1990 decision of the Supreme Soviet of the Armenian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] "On the Future Military Service of Armenian Servicemen Forced To Abandon Soviet Armed Forces' Units" has not been implemented and that as a result, many servicemen are unable to complete their real military service and thus are impeded from taking up civilian activities, the Armenian Republic's Supreme Soviet decides:

In fulfillment of the aforesaid 3 May decision of the Armenian SSR's Supreme Soviet, to instruct the Armenian Republic's Council of Ministers and Military Commissariat to solve within two months the problems related with the performance of military service in Army units stationed within the Republic's territory by Armenian servicemen who are citizens of the Armenian Republic and of other Soviet republics who were forced to abandon their Army units and could not carry out their military service.

[Signed] L. Ter-Petrosyan, chairman of the Armenian Republic's Supreme Soviet.
A. Saakyan, secretary of the Armenian Republic's Supreme Soviet.
Yerevan, 17 October 1990.

On Conscription

NC2310175590 Yerevan ARMENPRES International Service in Armenian 1215 GMT 22 Oct 90

[Text] Proceeding from the principles in the Armenian Republic's declaration "On the Independence of Armenia," the Armenian Republic's Supreme Soviet decides:

1. To suspend the enforcement on Armenian territory of the 12 October 1967 [date as received] USSR Law "On General Conscription".

2. That the actual military service of the Armenian Republic's citizens who are subject to conscription in 1990 should be done in army units stationed in Armenian territory. The citizens of the Armenian Republic who are subject to conscription could serve outside Armenia's borders of their own volition, in accordance with the provisions set forth by the Armenian Republic's Council of Ministers.

3. To instruct the Armenian Republic's Council of Ministers to begin the necessary relevant preparatory work in accordance with the second point of this decision and implement the conscription between 22 October and 22 December 1990.

[Signed] L. Ter-Petrosyan, chairman of the Armenian Republic's Supreme Soviet.
A. Saakyan, secretary of the Armenian Republic's Supreme Soviet.
Yerevan, 17 October 1990.

New State Commission Formed in Armenia

NC2310191990 Yerevan ARMENPRES International Service in Armenian 1215 GMT 22 Oct 90

[Text] Yerevan, 22 Oct (ARMENPRES)—A State Commission of the Armenian Government for Reforms and Target Projects has been formed. Its purpose is to consistently move Armenia toward establishing a market economy and to implement targeted policies and reforms.

Among the plans and proposals to be implemented by the commission are: restructuring and improvement of the management of economic sectors; radical alteration in the ministries' and departments' functions and in the system of foreign economic relations; the creation of economic and legal prerequisites for attracting foreign

capital; and forging a mechanism for the productive use of the Armenian diaspora's potential in reviving and developing the Republic's economy.

V. Manukyan, chairman of the Armenian Council of Ministers, was appointed chairman of the state commission.

Baku Introduces Passport System for Goods Purchase

LD2310165390 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 23 Oct 90

[Text] Following in the footsteps of other industrial centers in the country, a passport system has now been introduced in Azerbaijan's capital for the purchase of goods. The Baku executive committee announced the decision today.

Georgian Supreme Soviet Poll Procedures Detailed

LD2210143290 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1230 GMT 22 Oct 90

[From the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] On our night news program last week, we reported on irregularities in the election campaign in Azerbaijan uncovered by the program's correspondent. It seems that in Georgia they have concluded elections to the supreme soviet, to be held in a week, which need to be carefully evaluated:

[Begin recording] [Gongadze] For the first time, the election will be through mixed procedure. Voters will have to sign for two papers like these [Gongadze hold up two pieces of paper] which are printed in Georgian, Abkhaz, Osetian, Russian, Armenian, and Azeri. The first contains the names of political blocs and parties; the second, a list of individual persons.

There are to be 250 deputies elected to the new legislature, which is 40 percent less than the current Supreme Soviet of the Georgian Soviet Socialist Republic. It was learned today that only 12 political organizations are allowed to stand in the elections as opposed to 14.

What is the reason for the reduction in the number standing?

[Central Election Commission Chairman I. Zhordaniya] Two political organizations have been removed from the list: the Agrarian Union and the Stalin political organization. We denied them registration from the very outset, but they won the right to participate as a result of a decision by the Supreme Court and we were compelled to register them.

[Gongadze] But the Supreme Court decision was contested by students who went as far as to declare a hunger strike.

[Zhordaniya] The students' action had its effect, and the Supreme Court changed its decision. However to some extent the court's decision came too late because by that time the commission discovered a significant number of irregularities in the Stalin organization's party lists which disqualify it from taking further part in the contest. [end recording]

Georgian National Congress To Begin 26 October

LD2310163790 Moscow World Service in Russian 1030 GMT 23 Oct 90

[INTERFAX report from the "Soviet Chronicle" feature of the "Soviet Union Day by Day" program]

[Text] Elections to the Georgian National Congress have finished. More than half—50.88 percent—of the republic's inhabitants with the right to vote participated. It is remarkable that more than a third of the voters support the Party for National Independence, which obtained 71 out of 200 seats within this sociopolitical organization. The first sitting of the National Congress, according to preliminary reports, will take place on 26 October—two days before elections to the Georgian legislature.

Congress Elections Assessed

LD2410020590 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1623 GMT 23 Oct 90

[Report by TASS special correspondent Igor Gvritishvili]

[Text] Tbilisi, 23 Aug [TASS]—The Central Electoral Commission has described the results of the elections to the National Congress of Georgia (a Soviet republic in the Transcaucasus) as "successful and completely attaining their goal." The elections took place on 30 September-1 October, but their results were declared only yesterday after a three-week gap.

Members of the electoral commission today explained the reasons for the delay at a news conference by referring to "their lack of information on the precise number of voters in the republic and technical equpment for counting the votes." The Central Electoral Commission's data on the Georgian Supreme Soviet elections (3.6 million voters) scheduled for 28 October gave rise to doubt among them.

With the help of National Congress activists, an independent count was made of the number of voters and completed only on 20 October. There turned out to be just under 3 million of them. Taking this information as the starting-point, 50.9 percent of the electorate took part in the elections to the Natinal Congress which makes the voting results valid.

Replying to a TASS correspondent's question one of the members of the electoral commission stressed that the authorities had not created any obstacles to voting. Quite the opposite in fact, they made premises for polling stations available and provided some technical assistance. At the same time it was noted that in a number of rayons members of opposition parties that were not taking part in the elections threatened to try and stop people from making their way to the ballot boxes. There were also attempts to destroy electoral rolls.

In the opinion of local observers, although the elections to the National Congress constituted an important event in the life of Georgia, they do not reflect the real line-up of political forces in the republic. The Georgian Communist Party, the bloc of opposition parties united to form a "roundtable", and the Popular Front of Georgia, which according to the latest public opinion poll are the most realistic contenders for victory in the elections to the republic's Supreme Soviet, did not take part in the elections.

The National Congress elections were held at the initiative of a number of opposition parties. It does not aspire to political power in Georgia but is conceived as a consolidator of the national liberation movement and as a means of informally monitoring the actions of state bodies.